DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 895 IR 051 405

TITLE	Access and Services: Shaping the Future. Minutes of the Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (106th, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 16-17, 1985).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	85
NOTE	142p.; For the minutes of the 105th meeting, see ED 261 696.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 (ARL members, $7.50; nonmembers, $12.50).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; *Cataloging; Conferences; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Information Networks; Library Associations; Library Automation; Library Catalogs; Library Planning; *Library Services; Position Papers; *Research Libraries; Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS	*Association of Research Libraries; Library Materials Conservation; *Retrospective Conversion (Library Catalogs)

ABSTRACT

Minutes from the 1985 Membership Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) include the full-text of the presented paper, "Proposal for a North American Program for Coordinated Retrospective Conversion," by Jutta Reed-Scott, and the comments of a six-member panel, made up of members of the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control, on the proposal. Duane E. Webster introduces the topic, "Services: The OMS (Office of Management Studies) Public Services Program," and a six-member panel describes the experiences of the test libraries with the self-evaluation program. Discussion and comments follow the papers. The business meeting, which is covered in detail, begins with two special reports, one on the National Endowment for the Humanities and one on the council on Library Resources (CLR). The following reports are also included: (1) Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials; (2) ARL President's Report; (3) ARL Executive Director's Report; (4) report from the Office of Management Studies; and (5) report from the Committee on ARL Statistics. At this meeting it was also agreed that Laval University would be invited to join the Association. Eight appendices of supporting information include an ARL Office Activities and Status Report; Report from the CLR Bibliographic Services Development Program; Status of OMS Programs; excerpts from the OMS 1984 Annual Report; lists of attendance from member institutions, members, and guests and staff; a list of officers, the board, and committees and task forces of ARL; membership of ARL; and the financial report for 1984. (THC)

1R

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OERI
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official position or policy.

May 16-17, 1985
Cincinnati, Ohio

ED264895

Minutes of the 106th Meeting

The Association of Research Libraries

IR051405

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OFFICERS AND BOARD

1985

Richard J. Talbot, University of Massachusetts — President

Anne Woodsworth, University of Pittsburgh — Vice President/President-Elect

Eldred Smith, University of Minnesota — Past President

Hugh C. Atkinson, University of Illinois (Oct. 1985)

Patricia Battin, Columbia University (Oct. 1985)

Richard E. Chapin, Michigan State University (Oct. 1987)

Graham R. Hill, McMaster University (Oct. 1986)

Herbert F. Johnson, Emory University (Oct. 1986)

W. David Laird, University of Arizona (Oct. 1986)

Margaret Otto, Dartmouth College (Oct. 1987)

Joseph Rosenthal, University of California, Berkeley (Oct. 1987)

Paul Vassallo, University of New Mexico (Oct. 1985)

STAFF

Shirley Echelman	Executive Director
Duane E. Webster	Deputy Director and Director, Office of Management Studies
Pingfeng Chi	Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials
Jaia Barrett	Program Officer
Julia Blixrud	Conser A&I Project Coordinator
Nicola Daval	Information Officer
Jeffrey J. Gardner	Associate Director, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey Heynen	Program Officer
Susan Jurow	Training Program Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Jutta R. Reed-Scott	Collection Development Specialist, Office of Management Studies, and ARL Recon Project Coordinator
Maxine K. Sitts	Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies

Access and Services: Shaping the Future

Minutes of the 106th Meeting

May 16-17, 1985
Cincinnati, Ohio

1985
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually by the Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: ARL Members: $15.00 per year, $7.50 an issue
Nonmembers: $25.00 per year, $12.50 an issue

Editor: Nicola Daval
Association of Research Libraries

Association of Research Libraries
Minutes of the meeting. 1st-
Dec. 1932-
[Princeton, N.J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.

INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st-42d, Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59-30046

Library of Congress

Printed in U.S.A. ISSN 0044-9652

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Opening 1

ACCESS: A PLAN FOR COOPERATIVE RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION

INTRODUCTION
Joseph Rosenthal 3

PROPOSAL FOR A NORTH AMERICAN PROGRAM FOR COORDINATED RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION
Jutta Reed-Scott 4

PANEL: COMMENTS FROM THE ARL COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL
Remarks by Robin Downes 8
Remarks by Martin Runkle 10
Remarks by Marianne Scott 10
Remarks by David Bishop 11
Remarks by Sharon Hogan 12
Remarks by Joseph Rosenthal 12

DISCUSSION 14

SERVICES: THE OMS PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION
Duane E. Webster 25

PANEL: THE TEST LIBRARIES' EXPERIENCES
Brown University: Merrily Taylor 29
University of California, Riverside: Joan Chambers 32
Columbia University: Patricia Battin 35
Michigan State University: Richard E. Chapin 38
Univesity of North Carolina: James F. Govan 41
Temple University: James Myers 43

DISCUSSION 45

BUSINESS MEETING

Page

Special Report: NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES
ARL Board of Directors Resolution on NEH 49
Remarks by Richard Ekman 49
Remarks by Harold Cannon 51

Special Report: COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES
Remarks by Warren J. Haas 52
Remarks by Deanna Marcum 54
Remarks by C. Lee Jones 55
Remarks by Herbert F. Johnson 57

Report from the Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials 59

Consideration of New Members 60

ARL President's Report 61

Report of the ARL Executive Director 63

Report from the Office of Management Studies 65

Report fromthe Committee on ARL Statistics 67

APPENDICES

A. ARL Office Activities and Status Report, November 1984-April 1985

B. Report from the Council on Library Resources Bibliographic Services Development Program, May 15, 1985

C. Status of OMS Programs, October 1984-April 1985

D. Excerpts from of the Office of Management Studies 1984 Annual Report

E. Attendance at the 106th Membership Meeting
Member Institutions
Name Index for Members and Staff
Guests

F. Officer, Board of Directors, and Committees and Task Forces of the Association

G. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries

H. Financial Report for 1984

7

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 106th Meeting

Richard J. Talbot, Presiding

The 106th Membership Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Westin Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 16-17, 1985. The program session convened on May 16.

ACCESS: A PLAN FOR
COORDINATED RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION

Introduction

MR. ROSENTHAL: You have all received the report that will form the basis of the attention given in this program to retrospective conversion.[1] The report is the product of a planning study carried out for ARL by Jutta Reed-Scott during the first three months of this year, with funding from the Council on Library Resources. I would like to emphasize that the report represents the work of the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control. As such it has been a part of the Association of Research Libraries program and, specifically, the ARL five-year Plan of Action relating to Objective Two: Access and Collections. I believe it is important, as we look at the report and discuss the issues arising out of it, that we recognize its relationship to the ARL Plan of Action. In discussions earlier this week, it became even more apparent to those of us that have been working in the bibliographic control area that the proposed retrospective conversion program is an integral part of the overall effort devoted to extending resources of research libraries in North America. It is also essential to related efforts in both collection development and preservation.

I would like to introduce to you Jutta Reed-Scott, who prepared the report on retrospective conversion. Jutta has been Director for Collection Development and Bibliographic Control at Dartmouth College, and is now a staff member of the Association of Research Libraries, working in part with OMS in the North American Collections Inventory Project. In addition to the report that you have before you this morning, you will remember that she is also the author of Issues in Retrospective Conversion, which set the basis for the Springhill Conference last year. That conference sponsored, by the Council on Library Resources, was the major stimulus for the action that has resulted in the present report and this discussion.

PROPOSAL FOR A NORTH AMERICAN PROGRAM FOR COORDINATED RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION

Jutta Reed-Scott
ARL Recon Project

MS. REED-SCOTT: As Joe Rosenthal just mentioned, retrospective conversion (recon) and, specifically, the development of an ARL plan for coordinated retrospective conversion, is an important component of the ARL five-year plan. It also supports ARL's long-term goal of improving access to research library holdings.

The immediate driving forces for a more systematic, collaborative approach to retrospective conversion are the magnitude and complexity of recon needs. A look at the current status of retrospective conversion in ARL libraries illustrates the dimension of that problem. Over the next five years, Association of Research Libraries members expect to convert to machine-readable form records for 45 million monographic titles. It is true that the major effort will be capturing existing records, but at a minimum, six to seven million new records must be created as ARL libraries implement local recon plans. Still, the question is whether a collaborative, structured program on retrospective conversion is feasible.

It is against this background that the goals of the coordinated approach have been formulated. They are to: (1) assist the research libraries in converting their bibliographic records effectively and economically, (2) support the sharing of bibliographic records, (3) minimize duplication of efforts, and (4) strengthen funding opportunities. In my comments today, I want to focus primarily on the development of a plan of action—the proposed North American Program for Coordinated Retrospective Conversion. Development of the plan involved five major areas: (1) the establishment of retrospective conversion goals, (2) identification of program elements, (3) determination of funding requirements, (4) establishment of priorities to provide a program focus, and (5) determination of concrete steps that would need to be taken to implement the plan.

The first step in the investigation was to determine the scope of retrospective conversion—that is, to estimate how many records for monographs have not yet been converted. Our inquiry followed two paths. First, a survey was mailed to all ARL libraries to determine recon plans for the next five years. The analysis of those questionnaires indicated that 58 members plan to convert all records in their collections, and another 45 plan to convert selectively. In the aggregate, as I mentioned a moment ago, ARL libraries plan to convert records for 45 million monographic titles. The survey also asked ARL libraries to recommend potential collections to be converted under the proposed plan; respondents proposed 20.5 million titles for potential conversion. Second, Martin Dillon, of the University of North Carolina, conducted a statistical study to determine the number of yet unconverted records. The results of his study indicated that six to seven million unique records for monographs are not yet available in machine-readable form.

---

1. The final version of the report, revised following this meeting, has been published by the Association as: Plan for a North American Program for Coordinated Retrospective Conversion, prepared by Jutta Reed-Scott. Washington, D.C., Association of Research Libraries, 1985.

The analysis of the data shaped the development of the plan in several important areas. It underscored the need for a systematic approach, for establishing priorities, and for a phased, long-range timetable. Most importantly, the analysis shaped the emphasis of the plan on first-time conversion of records. It also highlighted the opportunity for fund-raising and coordinated action.

The second phase of the investigation focused on identifying the program elements. The essence of the plan is a pluralistic, coordinated approach. The central program component is the division of responsibility so that each cooperating library begins its conversion efforts with monographs in one or more areas of its collection strength. The subject areas would be defined by LC classification and supported by collection evaluations or National Shelflist Count data. The result would be the synchronized conversion of a series of collections with complementing collection strengths.

Another challenge was to determine how the program should be organized and overseen. In evaluating several options, it was clear that ARL is the logical sponsor of the program. While there is strong support for ARL as the lead agent, the difficult question remained as to what role ARL should play in implementing the program. The options range from an active role as program administrator to an advisory role of encouragement and endorsement. The plan suggests that a middle course should be followed: ARL should carry out the overall implementation and coordination of the program but not operate specific projects. The report also recommends that the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control should have program oversight responsibility, and that ARL should create a new position of a part-time program coordinator.

Central to the program is the sharing of records so that records will be converted only once. It was known from the beginning that the provision of open access to records created under the program was a difficult goal to accomplish. To work toward an equitable process for sharing records, the ARL Committee on Bibliographic Control proposes a phased approach. Central to that approach is the exchange of tapes of first time records created under the program among the major utilities. In addition, tapes would be distributed to the Library of Congress, the National Library of Canada, and other not-for-profit organizations.

Not all of the economic, political, and technical difficulties of effective open access to newly-created bibliographic records have been resolved, but the proposed mechanism is an important step toward that goal. It ensures that the Library of Congress is a participant in the program and that records will be available to research libraries regardless of network affiliation.

Successful coordination of recon efforts must be based on agreed-upon guidelines for record fullness and consistency. There is considerable disagreement on the issue of record standardization and uniformity and especially on the extent of authority work. Because libraries have different priorities and different requirements, and because of different views regarding the feasibility of machine-aided authority control, it was difficult to reach consensus on this issue. The proposed guidelines are included in the report and define minimum requirements. But the debate over the guidelines continues and it is likely that a few more changes may be made in them. Furthermore, the process or mechanism for encoding records is still under discussion. The encoding will allow libraries to identify the extent of authority work in each record.

A third major focus of the investigation was the determination of funding requirements. It is clear that retrospective conversion competes for funds with other library needs. Concurrently, there is little reason to expect new funding at the Federal level. There are, however, some encouraging signs regarding funding. New York State has passed legislation supporting retrospective conversion. Several regional and national foundations are becoming interested in retrospective conversion activities, and several collaborative programs have been funded. On balance, the development of a systematic retrospective conversion plan should improve funding opportunities. At the same time, it is obvious that a large-scale recon effort requires substantial funding. The economic reality is that research libraries must also commit institutional funds to match external funding.

There are two major funding categories. One is the funding of the ARL coordination of the program. The plan recommends that a special membership assessment be established with a provision for evaluation by the ARL Board in 1987. The reason for that assessment are three-fold. It would demonstrate to funding agencies the ARL membership's commitment to the program, and it would put ARL in a stronger position to serve as an advocate for funding the program. At the same time, ARL would not be in direct competition with individual projects for foundation support.

Perhaps the most difficult decision centered on the question of subsidies for libraries participating in the program. Accepting the magnitude of recon needs and finite resources, the plan proposes a baseline subsidy to underwrite a portion of the cataloging costs for first-time converted records. While it is almost impossible to establish exact cost projections, a general estimate was that in excess of $25 million would have to be raised over the five-to ten-year span of the program. These figures are sufficiently daunting and present a strong case that only limited subsidies can be expected.

Given the range of ARL members' recon needs, the plan needed to be realistic in recommending what can be accomplished in the short term. A building block approach seemed the only feasible answer. The plan recommends that five subject areas be targeted initially. The coordinated conversion of the priority areas would provide the initial focus and it would allow funding requirements to be scaled down to manageable goals. The five proposed subjects include philosophy and religion, Slavic studies, Latin American studies, and selected subjects in engineering and in agriculture. These priorities were determined on the basis of high membership interest, positive outlook for potential funding, and collection strengths.

It is premature at this point to describe the proposed implementation. Instead, I would like to focus briefly on several key issues. The need for cooperative action in retrospective conversion has long been recognized, but the development of an actual program has been slow. One underlying concern is the question of whether there is still time for cooperative action, or whether the current thrust toward distributed systems and decentralization reduces the need of a collective response. There are some positive signs that suggest cooperative action is still desirable and feasible. For example, the proposed coordinated project for music has been funded on a pilot basis under Title II-C. The large percentage of ARL libraries that indicate support in the recon questionnaires are, however, the most important factor. Equally important, a number of potential coordinated projects are emerging, including one project to convert Slavic titles and another in religion.

The role of the Library of Congress in the program is also a major concern. It is clear that LC's role is still evolving.

Still another key issue centers on the uncertainty of funding the program. While the outlook is guardedly optimistic, raising the funds needed will be a difficult task. The economic issue is part of a broader question about the extent to which it is possible for individual libraries to participate in the program with only partial subsidies.

While many difficult issues remain, progress has occurred in several areas. The major bibliographic utilities have agreed to share records created under the program. Guidelines have been developed for recon records and have received widespread review. Data to define the scope of not-yet converted titles is available. Yet, the most positive factor is the amount of attention and energy devoted by staff in the ARL libraries to the recon problem.

If implemented, the proposed North American Program for Coordinated Retrospective Conversion would be the largest collaborative effort undertaken by ARL. At this meeting, members of the Association have the opportunity to examine and discuss the proposed action plan. In the discussion groups that follow, you will be able to explore the various issues. If there are, however, some specific questions relating to the technical details of the plan, I will be happy to answer them at this point. Thank you very much.

MR. TALBOT: Do you have any questions at this point? I will let Joe explain the mechanical details of the rest of this session.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Jutta's presentation this morning seemed to me to suggest that all this had happened as if by magic. I want to assure you that there was an enormous amount of hard work on the part, not only of Jutta, but also your ARL staff, and I would like to express my thanks for that effort in the contribution that has resulted in this report. Thank you very much.

After a short coffee break, we will assemble in discussion groups. It is an indication on the part of, and indication of interest, of strong interest, that a number of members of the ARL Board of Directors have agreed to serve as discussion leaders and they, as well as members of the Committee on Bibliographic Control, will be your guides through the discussion.

PANEL: COMMENTS FROM THE ARL COMMITTEE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

MS. SLOAN (Indiana University): It is a pleasure to welcome you to the second session devoted to our review of the ARL Plan for a North American Program for Coordinated Retrospective Conversion. This document, as you know, is the product of considerable effort by the ARL staff and the Committee on Bibliographic Control, whose members are here and from whom you will hear shortly. The Council on Library Resources provided the funding for the effort.

I would like to take a moment to note that the proposed plan that you have before you should be viewed in the context of the five-year plan that this Association adopted two years ago. As the chair of the Coordinating Committee on Collections and Access, it has become increasingly clear to me that without the availability of the bibliographic records, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for the Association to achieve the goals that were outlined in the five-year plan. Therefore, this plan for conversion is an integral part and an important step in the accomplishment of the ARL Plan.

In that regard, I would just like to make note of the considerable progress that ARL has made in one of the important elements involved in the successful accomplishment of our plan; that is, in assuring that the records added to the utilities as part of this project will be available to all libraries, no matter what their utility affiliation.

Finally, I would like to remind you all that the proposed plan should be viewed really as a pilot. We are asking for funding for a two-year program. At the end of that time we expect to bring the results to the membership again. This is an opportunity to test whether, in fact, ARL can achieve some of the goals that were outlined in the plan. I do not wish to suggest, however, that there are no questions about the document that you have before you. It is quite a detailed and technical paper, and the discussions held in the small groups revealed that there were considerable questions.

Today's panelists, instead of reporting to you the results of each of the small group discussions, will take a slightly different tack. Each panelist has selected a topic to discuss and in the context of these discussions, we hope that the questions and concerns that emerged from the discussions yesterday will be addressed. There will be ample time, however, for questions and comments from the floor at the conclusion of the panel discussions.

As I said, the members of the panel are the members of the Committee on Bibliographic Control, the group that has worked most closely with this plan. I would like to turn now to our first panelist, from the University of Houston, Robin Downes.

Remarks by Robin Downes

MR. DOWNES (University of Houston): From the comments I heard yesterday, both in the small group discussion and in other places, it was clear that the ARL directors, in general, supported the idea of a plan for a coordinated retrospective conversion. But after profound investigation of some details of the ARL plan, there was a perceived conflict between local priorities and the national priorities represented by the plan.

Members of ARL doubted whether a national plan would be flexible enough and questioned whether it would have the authority needed to be successful. I heard no criticism of the projected benefits of the ARL plan, which defines programs of collection management, resource sharing, and preservation, in terms of the bibliographic substructure on which they depend. These benefits are clearly outlined on pages 9 and 10 of the report, so I will not repeat them. They are an integral part of the ARL Plan of Action, it should be pointed out, which includes a task for 1985 under Objective Two, Improving Systems of Access, that ARL will develop a position or plan for the coordination of a program of retrospective conversion. ARL will identify potential participants in a plan for coordinating cataloging and preservation.

The retrospective conversion plan is an action plan to implement this part of the ARL Plan of Action. Beyond the serious concerns expressed yesterday about the proposed plan, it was my impression that the very detailed nature of the plan has focused attention on issues which should be left, after policy decisions are made, to a project manager and an advisory group. Many of these issues cannot be resolved by a committee of the whole as represented by the ARL membership.

Let me use the CONSER program as an analogy. I expect that if the ARL membership were now faced with a proposal to establish the CONSER program, it probably would raise the same doubts and questions we have heard. CONSER is a comprehensive bibliographic program which has been operated with a minimum of centralized administration and which offers a decentralized service of conversion projects. The existence of a coordinated CONSER program has encouraged the submission of funding proposals and has raised the competence of funding agencies in evaluating these proposals. Because it is a voluntary program, each library is able to establish its own balance between national and local priorities. The availability of a comprehensive CONSER database has reduced the amount of redundant cataloging on all databases that load CONSER tapes.

If we carry the CONSER analogy further, we see benefits from resource sharing 2nd can observe a plan with objectives and outcomes which are comparable with—if not identical to—the ARL plan for retrospective conversion.

Every analogy with CONSER demonstrates conclusively to me that it is possible to conduct a successful conversion plan at the national level, that such a plan can be managed to respond to the concerns of participants, that it can demonstrate successful outcomes in a reasonable period of time, and thus, by analogy, that it can contribute to the achievement of the ARL Plan of Action.

MS. SLOAN: As I said, I would like to allow each of the panelists to take questions later.

The next topic is the standards and the issues surrounding them. Martin Runkle.

Remarks by Martin Runkle

MR. RUNKLE (University of Chicago): There is some question about the concept of bibliographic records that would be created as part of the program—some people thought the standards were too high and some not high enough. I do not know that we can reach ultimate and specific agreement on the statement. I would clarify a couple of things, if I may, in the specific requirements as they are given in the proposal. The standards really are not very high and they are quite flexible. There are very few mandatory elements and even for those, it is not required that you put in valid information if it is not readily available—the guidelines simply say the fields must be there. Most of the fields are specified as "required" rather than "mandatory," and the institutions say they are required if they are present on the source record.

In looking just at the guidelines, one could convert quite a brief record using a brief shelflist record and it would follow the standard. Elsewhere in the document, however, it is stated that it is recommended that the proposed guidelines define minimal requirements for records to be converted under the program, and that records chosen for conversion reflect as complete information as can be found for the libraries' catalogs. For most of us, this means not going by the shelflist card only, but using the records from other catalogs as well. The intent is to get as complete a record as possible so that other libraries can then use it without further work. As we know, sometimes that can be costly or difficult.

One might think of three levels. The first would be a very brief record where anything goes. The second might be standard, traditional cataloging, as the Library of Congress might have done at the time the book was cataloged. The third level would be bringing the record up to current standards, which might mean re-cataloging; entry headings, particularly, would be where the greatest expense would come in, if catalogers were required to search authority files to change all the headings to AACR2. Some people believe that such searching and updating is better done in a batch mode by passing batches of records against online authority files to convert the records to AACR2.

In conclusion, and there is no firm conclusion except, again, that the intent is to get as full a record as possible; this will have to be an ongoing concern. In fact, the standards may vary from project to project, depending on the nature of the materials that are being converted.

Remarks by Marianne Scott

MS. SLOAN: The next topic is the availability and distribution of records.

MS. SCOTT (National Library of Canada): One of the obvious issues in this approach to coordinated reconversion is the accessibility of records. We all know that one of the major elements in an economically feasible conversion program is accessibility to machine-readable records. One of the things that the proposed ARL program has done is, even in its discussion stages, is encourage the utilities to consider ways of making recon records available to users outside their own particular group of participants. We are all pleased that we had a statement from the Research Libraries Group some time ago about their approach to this and their willingness to do what they can to make these records available, and we all busily reading the recent statement from OCLC on this very issue.

The national agencies, the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada, will have to continue to work with each other as they are doing, and with utilities, to ensure that the records are accessible, and to work out the details. Probably the one thorny issue that remains, because it is a bit more complicated, is to ensure that the records created in U.S. utilities are available to Canadian libraries, and those that are created north of the border will be available easily in the U.S. as well. I believe the goodwill we have seen so far in this issue bodes well for its success.

Remarks by David Bishop

MS. SLOAN: The role of the Library of Congress is next.

MR. BISHOP (University of Georgia): I would like to speak for a minute about the role of the Library of Congress in a coordinated recon project. I do not believe this was raised as a particular concern, but I believe it is important and it is an issue that we need to consider. I see LC's involvement in the program as one of the most important elements in the area of distribution of records. As part of the project, RLG has agreed to distribute first-time records to the Library of Congress without restriction. OCLC has agreed to distribute records to LC, and, "From the records, LC would be able to draw records derived from LC printed cards from the file, modify them, and incorporate them into the MARC file and redistribute them." The importance is beginning to establish the precedence of pre-1968 LC cataloging records being added to the LC MARC file and being maintained by the Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress has made it clear they cannot absorb massive amounts of retrospective records at one time. But this would be a start, as it would begin to incorporate pre-1968 LC records into the LC MARC file. There is also a question of standards. The Library of Congress routinely requires more authority work and higher standards than are outlined in the recon guidelines. But if the records added to the LC MARC file by some recon projects—for example, those involving NACO participants—working at this higher standard to produce a sizeable number of records added to the LC MARC file directly to be maintained and distributed by the Library of Congress, it could result in revised standards and practices like the Library of Congress that would allow large numbers of records to become a part of the LC MARC file. Over the long haul the more the Library of Congress is able to become involved in the maintenance of these recon records, the less burdensome that maintenance will be for all of us.

There is another issue on a different topic that was raised in the discussion groups I would like to discuss for a minute, and that is the five subjects that were proposed as the initial subjects. The subjects were viewed in many cases as being restrictive; but it is important to realize that any projects would be acceptable. These subjects were really tallies of responses by ARL libraries to the recon questionnaire, and in that sense were indicated as being the most important. For those of you who have an interest in subjects other than these, you should be aware that you may participate in the project. The important thing is that the efforts you take be coordinated. In no way would a lack of interest in those particular five subjects restrict you from participating in the project.

Remarks by Sharon Hogan

MS. SLOAN: The next topic is application of technology.

MS. HOGAN (Louisiana State University): Over the last two decades the application of technology in libraries has almost become synonymous with the way we do business. On several campuses practices have become models for the automation of the campus from front-end processors to micros to fiber optics. We have had to become educated as to how technology can and will change the way we do our work. Retrospective conversion is no exception. Under a coordinated ARL plan, the ARL staff could monitor the changes in technology applicable to retrospective conversion and aid libraries in the planning for the impact of these changes.

There are four areas that will affect retrospective conversion planning. The first is the project being undertaken by the Library of Congress. They have contracted with a company, Optiram, to conduct a test of converting records using optical scanning. The project is halfway through, and in about six months we should know the results of this pilot to see if it will be applicable to libraries, and, in fact, if it is cost-effective. At the moment, we seem to be at a point where the optical scanning, in fact, works but it remains to be seen whether a software program can be written to turn what is read into a MARC record.

Second will be the development of the optical discs. A number of companies have gone into this business. It seems reasonable that the major bibliographic utilities could also go this way and provide us with the data in our libraries through this mechanism. We have also been hearing for the last several years about the Linked Systems Program. As this goes forward and is worked out between the utilities, the problem of the distribution of records could be removed.

Finally, there is a whole question of communications—the cost of them and how they are developing—as we begin to discover the effects of breakup of AT&T. ARL has been very active in helping us understand the changes in this area and will continue to do so.

Remarks by Joseph Rosenthal

MS. SLOAN: We have saved the best for last, and have asked the chair of our committee, Joe Rosenthal, to deal with the question of funding.

MR. ROSENTHAL: I would like to speak about two concerns that came to the fore in some of the discussion groups. Just as a starter, I would like to note that although this group has been dealing with concerns and reservations expressed in the discussion groups, there was a great deal of approval—even verging on enthusiasm in some quarters—for the proposed program.

One concern was the addition to the ARL staff, sometimes referred to as the creation of a bureaucracy. That concern, with overwhelming staff activities and all the needs that go along with that, seems to be the one expressed by most of the members of the Association. We believe, however, that as the program developed and as Jutta worked on it and the Bibliographic Control Committee and the staff worked with her, the resulting two-year fledgling effort is about as inconsequential way to add staff and accoutrements to the Association as possible. It involves the real addition of a half-time coordinator and associated costs for investigation, i.e. postage, telephone, etc., that would go along with this effort. It does represent, however, a step for the Association in the way of activism. It is an active program, and if the Association is to engage in an active program, that requires some additional resources, even though modest.

The second concern that I would like to speak to is what was generally referred to as the level of subsidization. There was concern in a number of discussion groups about this, and the group in which I participated came to the conclusion that whatever is said on this subject needs to be said very carefully. It seems there are at least two concerns in this topic. One is the variation in cost that goes with converting a record or adding a holding to a North American database. There is recognition everywhere that the costs of converting records or adding holdings vary, particularly with the type of record being converted: How well does it meet the standards that are laid out? What is the cost of securing the fullest record available in a particular library? Does the work, for reasons that may be germane to the particular institution, involve some kind of fiddling or touching up or enhancing the actual catalog record; in other words, does it involve a decision on the part of the library to do some re-cataloging? Costs vary from region to region on the North American continent, with the particular strategy employed to convert, and oftentimes with the particular library situation.

What any statement of principle in this plan should not do is to bar a library or a group of libraries participating in a retrospective conversion program from securing funds. The program is not intended to put a maximum on the amount of money that would be secured for a given conversion project.

In conclusion, I believe there is need for this program, and one of the factors that I believe is important for the Association to consider is that the plan gives evidence that the North American organization that speaks for research libraries has given serious thought and effort to this topic, and that the project is an important one. The result is a program that will, I believe, prove attractive in garnering the resources that will help our libraries achieve the goals of this Association.

MS. SLOAN: Thank you, Joe. Before I turn this over to all of you for questions and comments, I would like to thank the panelists who worked hard over the year to prepare this plan. Again, our goal this morning was to try to clarify the nature of the program itself, to respond to the issues that we thought we heard from you during the group discussions, and, particularly, to emphasize the flexibility that we believe this program has. It is not a bureaucracy, it is not some order from on high. It is, in fact, a pilot program to test whether ARL can take the kind of active role that Joe discussed. Finally, the program is to help us to achieve the goals of coordination in selection, development, cataloging, and preservation to which this Association is committed.

DISCUSSION

MS. SLOAN: With that I would now like to turn to the audience. Are there questions or comments?

MR. De GENNARO (University of Pennsylvania): I wanted to comment on the two alternatives that were listed in the proposed program. One of them, you will recall, was the use of Optiram, which LC is investigating. The other was possibility of converting the National Union Catalog. I would like to urge that, if possible, those two be looked at together, such as actually using an OCR capability to convert the NUC; I am sure somebody has thought of that. Even if the Optiram technology in that particular company does not have what it takes to do the job, I believe that somehow or other there will be a company somewhere that has the equivalent capabilities. It seems the OCR capability is perhaps something whose time either has come or will come within the next year or two, probably during the life of this pilot project, and that we ought to be looking at that very carefully. The thought of all of these small recon projects going on in a variety of libraries all over North America disturbs me, because each one of them is going to be using the same steps, and it may not be as efficient as using a technology in a centralized environment.

MS. SLOAN: I wonder if Henriette Avram might want to comment on any of this? This is an action that the committee has recommended. But I would remind you, Dick, and others, that, in fact, these small projects are taking place even as we speak. This proposal is an effort to try to bring some cohesion, coordination, and planning to these projects.

MS. AVRAM (Library of Congress): We are, as you know, under contract with Optiram to convert 30,000 titles from the Library of Congress's records set. We chose the record set first because they are good records. While we are not too optimistic that they are going to be able to read these records optically and convert them to MARC format, we hope, as do you, that that will happen. In fact, we are going to go so far as to offer them, for what it might be worth, an extensive computer loan. We tried about 10 years ago to do something like this. The idea of using MARC records rather than pages of NUC was to give Optiram every opportunity to do the job. The MARC records are clearer, better records on a larger piece of paper than the records that are in the NUC. We are not giving them more complicated languages, either. As we stated, we will make the results of the pilot available to ARL libraries.

MR. STUDER (Ohio State University): I am one of the borderline enthusiasts that Joe referred to, and it is a self-serving position. The one criticism of the plan I have is that it is restrictive. I would like to see it covering comprehensively. The self-serving position is that I have about 900,000 records to convert. Even an incremental adjustment in that number would make this a very much easier task. I believe $500 a year is trivial; I volunteer $1000.

MS. SLOAN: Do I hear $1,500? Bill, we appreciate your support. Could you say a word about what you mean by "more comprehensive"?

MR. STUDER: The 900,000 records are spread across the LC classification from A to Z. I would think that if one is going to coordinate a plan, it is not several magnitudes of order greater to coordinate an entire plan. That may be a naive position, but I do not believe so, because the collection strengths are certainly out there in many other fields.

MR. BISHOP: The intent is not to be restrictive, and to allow any type of subjects. As I said earlier, what was identified in the appendix to the report was merely those topics in which the membership had expressed most interest in the recon survey.

MR. DOUGHERTY (University of Michigan): Consideration of this topic is difficult because to be appearing to speak against retrospective conversion is almost like speaking against motherhood. I am not speaking against retrospective conversion; to the contrary, I am very much an advocate. But I am concerned about the direction we are taking, and the rules and standards we are setting up for the profession.

We have done a very detailed cost study in Michigan to find out just what is involved and what amount of resources it will take to achieve a volume of retrospective reconversion of our collection. It is absolutely true that local circumstances were a major impact on the cost of retrospective conversion. In our case, we have a mix of very fine source records and very poor source records. We documented exactly what we did in retrospective conversion. We have a rather extensive project under way, it turns out, to convert our collection. We are looking at an out-of-pocket cost of $4 to 4.5 million, and the costs are pretty carefully constructed. We found out, for example, even using derived records—the cataloging copy available in our context—it is still going to cost a little over $2 million. There are many considerations: for example, standards, present and past procedures for editing and handling records, whether the records will be sent out for conversion which might save a lot of the cost. The problems will vary from the older library to some of the newer ones. It is a major undertaking, and one of the difficulties I would like the Association to consider are the different contexts.

We, I believe—and unconsciously I include myself in this—when we talk about converting records we are thinking of cataloging records. We talk about the full record, standard cataloging, minimum cataloging levels, etc., but it is always cataloging. Even though we say access, it is still cataloging, and that is the heart of the problem as far as I am concerned. We are trying to create records not for cataloging support but to provide users with access to the collection, and oftentimes—in fact, the majority of the times—an author, title, and publication date gets a user from where he is to the book he wants. Anyone who has ever used a CLSI system and made the terminals available to students understands that, from the students' point of view, they want access to the collection. They would be happy if we started to think in terms of providing access records, not minimal or some cut-down version of bibliographic records. Philosophically, we would begin to project a different image than we are now, and my assertion is the cost per record would plummet. We would not encumber others or ourselves with the intellectual package we have had to endure and work with all these years. Let's develop a new concept, call it an access record, and try to eliminate all the majority of terms.

MS. SLOAN: Are you suggesting that we delay action on this while the work on the access record takes place?

MR. DOUGHERTY: Yes. I would suggest that libraries go back and look at the cost. I do not care how you cut it. Even with cooperation, the magnitude of the problem—and deciding what it is we want to do, our standard, what is the purpose of all of this, etc.—is great. Are we trying to create catalog records for other libraries, for librarians, or for the users of libraries? How often have we really engaged our users in such a way they can understand the implications of one course or another course. If we ask users if they want full records, I will suspect they will say full records. I doubt if they know about AACR2 and the rest of it.

As far as the program is concerned, I believe there should be coordination of retrospective conversion, however we construct the program. But I believe, practically speaking, that the functional coordination for this must be at the utility level. It is really the responsibility, and actually the opportunity, for three or four utilities to get together and, at the operational level, cooperate and develop a unified strategy.

MS. BATTIN (Columbia University): I do have to disagree with my respected and esteemed colleague from Michigan on a couple of points. I believe his direction of an access record is a good one. We have do distinguish, however, between the kinds of access our users want. Some of our users are students, who are armed with a title or an author; others are scholars, who are involved in pretty serious work and need to have more detail and more information. We have had some faculty members at Columbia who are very skeptical of the online catalog we are in the process of implementing because they have had experience at other universities with automated circulation systems and found they were not sufficient to meet their needs. I agree that we do not know the answers to all of these.

My concern would be that, as Joe Rosenthal said, this is an area in which ARL has not moved before. It is an attempt to organize a national, active approach to a problem for a reasonably small cost, a very modest cost to each institution. I would support and urge all of us to move forward in a two-year project. It will cost us each a thousand dollars to find out some of the answers to these questions.

The only particular caution that I have on this is that we not look at the retrospective conversion of collections as collections, but look at the materials in the way that the disciplines use them. We should look at what we convert from the user's point of view rather than our own point of view of managing collections.

MR. SHANK (University of California, Los Angeles): I agree that a coordinated program is essential. It is symbolic, I believe—Joe, this is perhaps what you may have been getting at. When seeking funds from outside sources, it would be better if we did it together, so in some sense we show we know what we are doing in spending others' moneys. I am concerned about this as the particular direction. A lot of the libraries that were represented in my group yesterday had been engaged in retrospective conversion already, or were indeed done. Our own library is involved in a project that will probably come close to the cost that Dick Dougherty just mentioned. We have a commitment for about $3 million for 850,000 records. By the time we finish, it probably will be about a $4.5 million job. I would like to get the other $1.5 million.

Now, three things are missing for me. One is, as Bill Studer said, to increase the hit rate in the cataloging program we are using. This suggests that we should get one or another or all of the cataloging agencies—I do not want to call them all utilities—to induce libraries to do the conversion so that the hit rate will go up. For example, how about increasing the credit that one might get for contributing to a coordinated retrospective conversion program, which is an inducement for a library to get involved in a program?

The second thing that is missing, at least in the agency that I use, is some way of indicating what collections we intend to convert, either by subject classes or by collections, so that someone could look at the system and know whether his or her library should wait. For example, if you look at the ARL survey, it turns out the area that Columbia University and the University of California should cooperate in is children's literature. Try to negotiate a sale; it does not work.

The third thing that is missing is—if we continue to engage in using different computer-based cataloging utilities or sources or whatever you want to call them—an improvement of the ability to get access to all of the records we are going to convert or what we have already converted amongst these utilities.

I would opt for a coordinated program but I would like to see some kind of an organization of it that would aim at these three goals, the record of what we are doing, some inducement for libraries to be involved in these programs, and an improvement of the communications between the utilities.

MS. SLOAN: Would somebody on the panel like to respond to that?

MR. ROSENTHAL: The idea of knowing what is intended to be converted and what is being converted did surface in the discussions and came to the attention of the panel when it met late yesterday afternoon, and I believe it is a very good one. It does not seem to me conceptually difficult to maintain a database of just that information and make it available through OCLC, RLIN, WLN, LC, and whatever other organizations were participating. It is a good suggestion, and I would agree with all three of your recommendations, Russell.

MS. SLOAN: Anyone else?

MR. DOUGHERTY: I want to follow up something Pat Battin said. I believe that one has to approach retrospective conversion as a monolithic project. A physicist trying to access a book in nuclear physics needs one sort of record, a Shakespeare scholar needs something else. I would suggest records be constructed that provide access to the appropriate group of constituents. I am not talking about brief records, per se. I would like to try an analogy to make the point that I would like to see the Association consider.

On our campus we have a storage facility called the Buhr Storage Facility. When this became available the faculty were very unhappy, and I spent one year catching brickbats and slings and arrows and so forth. We now call that building the Buhr Shelving Facility, and its purpose is for preservation and security. It is the same old shelving storage facility but attitudes are beginning to change toward its role. And it seems to me we in the Association have been talking about a different purpose that gradually will convey a different impression. Sooner or later behavior—our own behavior, the behavior of our staff and the users of the library—will begin to reflect this different philosophy.

MR. BISHOP: It would seem to me what you are proposing in terms of standards for ongoing cataloging to provide minimum access to current materials as a future strategy might be very helpful. We have millions of full catalog records that have not been converted. The high cost of retrospective conversion comes into everything: e.g. going from a source document back to the book to correct information, or doing extensive authority work. There is a great deal of retrospective conversion that can be done at a relatively low cost by transcribing what is already on cards, and that is the major thrust of the program that we are proposing. I am not sure what relationship this access question has to the recon proposal.

MR. WYATT (University of Rochester): I believe Dick and Pat, in their own ways, are talking about basically the same problems in terms of access, and that is something that does need to be investigated. I would like to bring up a slightly different point that I believe is not dealt with very well in the proposal, but which we should consider because of the effect that the action that we may take here will have upon other institutions, libraries, and so forth beyond those represented in ARL. If, in fact, we go into a program like this, labeling it as a national coordinated retrospective conversion project, we will be setting a de facto standard not only for ourselves and for the rest of the profession, too, but also for the major funding agencies.

I believe most of the major funding agencies will welcome that kind of a program, and the definitions that we set forth. It will give them a basis upon which to measure the funds that they are putting into retrospective conversion. It may even have the effect of increasing the amount of money that we can gather into this field. It may also have the effect of channeling funds into a much narrower focus, and all the institutions that are trying to obtain money for conversion will probably have to use the standards that we set here. I believe the funding agencies will welcome this and that they will stand on it probably, more firmly that we will, in the future. Thus we must be very sensitive to what may appear to be a rather arrogant venture on the part of ARL.

MS. SLOAN: Does anyone wish to respond to that?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I am not quite sure where the sense of arrogance comes in.

MR. WYATT: If we do this, Joe, if we call it a nationally coordinated effort, the funding agencies, many of which are worried about this right now, will naturally take that to be an accepted standard. And it is not a nationally accepted standard, other than what we accept right here, right now. We have to get some of the cooperation of the other agencies and other institutions in order to make it so. I believe the funding agencies will see this as a standard and will channel their funds into those institutions or those retrospective conversion efforts that will meet the standards we set.

MR. ROSENTHAL: Are you speaking specifically or primarily to the record standard that is proposed?

MR. WYATT: I am speaking more to the record standard than any of the others. The agencies will welcome any standard we set; they are at a loss as to what to fund right now. We have had a considerable amount of retrospective conversion money in our institution and are getting more, but the agencies are not certain that the funds that they are putting into retrospective conversion and other library automation efforts are really being spent wisely. Anything that the profession or ARL settles for they are going to try to use, because it gives them a direction that they do not have presently.

MS. SLOAN: Thank you.

MR. EDELMAN (Rutgers University): Am I correct that we are eventually going to vote on this proposal?

MS. SLOAN: That is an option.

MR. EDELMAN: If that option were exercised, we are essentially voting the program as proposed?

MS. SLOAN: Well, obviously, when a motion is placed before the floor, Hank, this body has the opportunity to amend.

MR. EDELMAN: But all of this is on the program for today. It helps me think clearly because, having listened to the discussion yesterday and this morning, I would suggest we have no program at all. That means there is no agreement on the standard. It is probably impossible to find agreement on it, and we have heard substantial objections to even setting those standards here, so there is no agreement on that. The worst part I have heard, and I very much sympathize with the questions which were raised, is that we have no agreement whatsoever on how to go about choosing the topics to be converted. All of you say, we will take care of it a little here, a little there. If we go on record and say we have a program or a plan, I believe we ought to know what that really is. There is considerable disagreement. Pat says do it as the scholars need it. My colleague in Ohio says do it A through Z. It does not matter what way we do it, but it matters a lot how we do it. We need a standard. We have neither a standard or program for going about choosing projects. If you were asked to vote on a paper, to say we are committed to it, that we create an office for it, that costs us a thousand dollars for the next two years—that is a little more honest than the present notion. We would know what we are doing. I suggest we do not know and no one knows, and there is considerable disagreement.

MS. SLOAN: Would some of you like to say what we know?

MR. ROSENTHAL: Sure, I will speak to that. I believe there is a remarkable amount of agreement, particularly on standards. We have all participated in or at least been knowledgeable about the development of, for example, cataloging standards, in the past, and realize the toil and trauma that we have gone through in various code revisions. In a way, what has emerged from the past year of discussions about a record standard for retrospective conversion parallels some of the efforts at code revision. It builds on code revisions, as we have had it, but I believe the amount of agreement that has been arrived at is remarkable and the wide-spread discussion that has taken place in coming to a standard that is now reasonably well defined.

When Marty spoke to this it was in the framework of, yes, there is still dissention about a couple of points in a couple of fields in what has been proposed, about whether they should be 'mandatory' or 'required, if available,' whether there will be opportunity for further discussion. The Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group has this, I believe, on its agenda for another review at the ALA Meeting in July, but it is the expectation of the discussions that I have heard that there will be minor changes, if any, in what is going forth. When we consider that the utilities, the cataloging agencies, the Library of Congress, technical service directors from not only the large research libraries group but technical service directors in other research libraries have had the opportunity to comment on this standard, I believe it recommends a very well-defined compromise among various people involved. Compromise between wanting a record that is completely defined and full to an exhaustive standard, and wanting a record that tends in the diraction of what I understood Dick Dougherty to describe, as simply an access report.

I believe other parts of the plan are well-defined, too. But the plan recognizes that a lot of what would be involved in a coordinated program is in the doing of it, and that we would learn by experience, so it allows for a certain amount of learning by experience.

MS. SLOAN: Thank you. Marty?

MR. RUNKLE: I was not simply reflecting disagreement on a couple of minor points. The fact is the standard as it exists in some fields is not much of a standard. There is the statement and the intent that the record should be as full as possible. The fact is, given a century of cataloging rules and the variety of records which are available, it is impossible to specify what the standard should be. We merely have to live with an intent and judge the quality that is implied. The funding agencies will have to judge individual libraries as they put forth proposals. But I believe it does say a quick and dirty conversion of a shelflist that is a hundred years old may not be acceptable, that you want to do a little better than that.

I would like to echo what Joe said. This is a start. This is a multi-million dollar project, if one were to do it right and to the highest standards, and if we wait for that full-blown plan we will never do anything. This is simply a start at trying to coordinate some of the efforts that are going on.

MS. SLOAN: Mr. De Gennaro?

MR. De GENNARO (University of Pennsylvania): I would like to speak in favor of the plan. And I would like to offer a suggestion to Dick Dougherty about the records. Just as you solved your problem with the storage building by changing the name from storage building to shelving building, maybe you could solve your problems on the records by changing the name from limited cataloging record to an access record.

I would just like to say that, by and large, I am in favor of the plan. I also have some misgivings about the direction that ARL is taking in this, in becoming an active organization when we have others, but in fact this plan has been carefully worked out, over the last year or so. A considerable number of meetings, panels, and others committees have worked on it. To me it represents an incremental step forward.

We are talking about a pilot program for two years. We are talking about a small amount of money that each of us would contribute. I believe there is a lot to be learned from it. I would hope that we would have sense enough after a two-year period to reassess it, and if it is not working out, to back off from it. It is never easy to do that, but maybe we could on this occasion. I certainly believe we ought to back the efforts of the various committees and panels that have been working on this and take this incremental step, so I am in favor of it.

MS. SLOAN: Other comments?

MS. MARTIN (Johns Hopkins University): I would like to recommend backing the efforts, but in a slightly different way. I am very concerned about what appears to be a fair number of duplicative efforts. As I listen to the discussions, we seem to be aiming for ARL backing the principle of coordinated retrospective conversion: an attempt to convey to funding agencies that there is truly this backing; an attempt to convey to the so-called utilities a desire to move forward on the linking communications. A number of committees that are working on this, including the Bibliographic Control Committee and the Committee on Collections and Access. There are several vehicles that we already have that can provide some communication—this came up in our group discussion yesterday—that will form a basic part of what is needed for a coordinated retrospective conversion project. I would suggest it might be very appropriate to examine what we are already using towards the ends that we are talking about before embarking on a new project that will require additional funding.

MS. SLOAN: Does anyone wish to respond? Joe?

MR ROSENTHAL: The analyses that have been done to date could not have taken place without the assistance of the Council on Library Resources, who provided the support for Jutta Reed-Scott and the planning study that developed the proposed plan. The same is true of what has emerged as a proposal for a coordinated plan. Committees are all very well and good in their place, but I do not believe they would fill the concept of ARL as a leading and coordinating agency in such a program. And that of course is up to the membership.

MS. SLOAN: Thank you, Joe. Are there other comments?

MS. HOADLEY (Texas A&M University): I would like to support Dick Dougherty's stance of delaying for a while before we start this project for a couple of reasons. One Sue just talked about, the linking process. If I heard Lee Jones correctly yesterday, within a year the Linked Systems Project could be in place. That is going to be a much better situation for us than tape-loading from utility to utility, as it would make the process of retrospective conversion much easier and probably more satisfactory.

Secondly, I would like to urge that this program be a voluntary program. Robin talked about the CONSER project, which started out as a relatively small project on a voluntary basis and has grown and become very successful. Also as Hank has stated, there is not complete agreement on this particular topic. I have no difficulty with the principle of coordinated retrospective conversion, but I will let Bill Studer pay my $500 since he is volunteering to pay some extra. I do not have the same level of commitment some of the other members of the Association do.

We have done a full retrospective conversion. There are other libraries in that same boat. There are some libraries, according to surveys, that have not entered into retrospective conversion at all, so let's put it on a voluntary basis, and then go ahead and do it.

MS. AVRAM: I would like to correct an impression about the Linked Systems Project. What will be up and running soon is the exchange of authority data. That does not mean that we will be ready to exchange bibliographic records in a year. In fact, OCLC has made the statement that, so far, they are participating only in the authority part of the project. I believe, as much as I am looking forward to what LSP will do, to just do away with the recon plan or wait would be a mistake.

MS. BATTIN: I would like to talk a little about the proposal that the project be voluntary. That proposal misses the point: it is a national program, not local, prepared for local use, but rather to recreate a national database for national scholarship. A number of institutions have contributed a tremendous amount to that from which the rest of us have profited, and I would assume this program is based on the same motivation. We are not really doing this in order to get our local catalogs converted, but to provide a base, again, for a group of scholars who might happen to be attached to any one local institution at any time. Given what is happening in the electronic world, we would be using records from a national database. I believe it would be a mistake if we made it a voluntary program because I believe that is one of the reasons why the costs have been set so low; we can all contribute and we will all profit maybe 20 years from now, but there will be a benefit that is simply not quantifiable and attributable in that way.

MS. AVRAM: I promise I will not get up again, but I have to support what Pat said. In this morning's meeting, I heard Dick talk about the cost of retrospective conversion at a single institution, but what I have not heard anybody talk about is the aggregate cost of retrospective conversion. I wonder if anybody is aware of how many times you are all converting the same record and what that actually costs, rather than trying to have a coordinated national program. This is something very important to take into consideration.

MS. SLOAN: We are approaching coffee break time but I would like to hear from all of you who have something to say. Jim?

MR. WYATT: I just need to ask a quick question. To whom would the staff hired for this project report? I do not remember that in the report.

MS. SLOAN: Shirley, do you want to respond to that question?

MS. ECHELMAN: Yes. The advisory body for the project, especially in policy issues, is the Committee on Bibliographic Control. In terms of management, the staff member would report to me.

MS. SLOAN: Are there any other questions and comments at this time?

MS. ABELL (Yale University): I want to point out that the responsibility for retrospective conversion will continue to lie with the individual institutions—most of the responsibility will lie with those institutions, most of the costs will be borne by those institutions—and to delay in adopting this program means we delay in getting the benefits of coordination, in getting the benefits of having centralized advocate for the program, and for the various other kinds of advantages that we mentioned in the report.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I want to respond to Henriette on the question of cost. I believe it has implications for each university that decides to undertake retrospective conversion using the shelflist as the source record, filling in the gaps with additional records where that is necessary, because in many libraries the source record is so scanty that it probably would not meet anyone's minimum. There will be costs involved there.

It is absolutely true that it will cost about twice as much for a library if they have to build their own record. At Michigan there was a mythology we could save money by avoiding a derived process and creating our own records. That is not true and the staff now accept it. But even if all the records we wanted to use were in the database, we are talking about an out-of-pocket expenditure of over $2 million. We designed a study of using exactly the guidelines ARL is advocating, so I am not speaking for it or against it. But if you are setting up a project for whatever reason, that library cannot, when it gets down to paying the bill, find they are going to create their own de facto solution to the problem. We will be worse off than we are, instead of fighting this through and coming together with something we can all accept.

MS. SLOAN: These projects are taking place now at the costs you described.

Our president suggests that we are perhaps ready for a motion to vote, so I would like to turn the podium back to Richard Talbot.

MR. TALBOT: Before I present the motion from the Board, let me remind you we passed a motion last year that increases in the organizational dues should be limited to a range of 4-7% each year during the life of the plan. In looking at the Association's finances, it seems to us that whatever recommendation we may bring before you in October will be at the lower end of that range. This might be relevant to the consideration before us.

This is the motion that the Board of Directors passed yesterday.

> The Board of Directors recommends that ARL proceed with a recon pilot program, and that the 1986 and 1987 ARL dues increase include $500 each year to cover expenses of the project.

As that is the motion from the Board, it requires no second and is now on the floor for discussion. Is there further discussion or suggestions on this motion?

MS. HOADLEY: I thought the report said that the funding for this would be a special assessment, and I believe I just heard you say we are talking about this as a part of the dues increase. To me those are two different things.

MR. TALBOT: You are partially right. Any kind of assessment is really a dues increase.

MS. HOADLEY: But a dues increase is permanent.

MR. TALBOT: What this motion says is it would be included in your bill as part of the dues increase for only two years, and then the dues would go down by that amount.

MS. HOADLEY: Would that be made a part of the official record so the Board two years from now would be reminded of that?

MR. SHANK: I make a motion we separate this into two segments.

MR. TALBOT: There is a motion to divide this motion. Is there a second? Sterling Albrecht seconds it. All in favor of dividing the motion into two parts: the general funding and pilot project? Does everybody understand the motion? All in favor say "aye". Opposed?

I believe it has not carried. We will need a hand vote. All in favor of dividing the motion, please raise your hands and hold them up until the teller counts your vote. All those opposed to division please raise your hands. The result is 34 for to 45 against; the motion has failed. We are back to the main motion. Further discussion on the main motion. All in favor of the main motion please say "aye". Opposed? I believe the motion has passed.

SERVICES: THE OMS PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM

Introduction

MR. WEBSTER: I welcome the opportunity to discuss the experiences we have had with the new OMS Public Services Program. Placement of a topic on an ARL Membership Meeting agenda is always a significant event; I measure it as an indicator of director interests. When directors are concerned about a topic, very frequently something happens. For example, this morning the topic was Retrospective Conversion and the changes that are needed in this regard, particularly from the point of view of what the Association should be doing to address that topic. Earlier programs have addressed other topics of equal significance.

Ultimately, these internal as well as external developments manifest themselves in changes in the way services are provided to users of information resources. The work and accomplishments in areas such as retrospective conversion and online catalogs must be matched by alterations and improvements in the Public Services arena. Traditional public service practices must be altered in order to embrace these technological advances, operational improvements, and enhance our services to scholars.

Today, we will look at the questions of what changes are needed in the Public Services arena and how that change process may be accelerated. I am going to provide a little background on the OMS Public Services Study projects, then we are going to have the directors from six of the institutions that completed self studies as part of the project reflect on the key issues as they see them in this exciting area of Public Services.

First, some background. You have received a number of materials that were distributed in advance providing descriptive information concerning the project. I want to underscore several aspects of the program. First, of course, is the support provided by the General Electric Foundation with a grant of $250,000. The central purpose of this grant was to provide assistance and advice to research libraries interested in examining, strengthening, and extending their Public Services.

The project has had several components. The first involved development of self-study resources and the testing and refinement of those materials in seven ARL member libraries during a series of test projects. In addition to the self-study component, there were a series of sponsored research studies which were shorter, more focused projects addressing specific public services questions. For example: Who are the non-users on a particular campus and what are their characteristics? Who are the invisible users, those people who access our resources on an electronic basis? and How can you evaluate alternative end user services? These sponsored research projects reports are available to interested libraries from the ARL Office of Management Studies.

Today, my principal focus will be the structural self-study methodology. Using this methodology, participants are helped to address the day-to-day operational concerns that need the active attention of the library, such as: the adequacy of the graphics system, the disposition of complaints from concerned users, and the deployment and use of staff at Public Service points. But in addition to the operational concerns that frequently surface and receive a great deal of attention in these studies, there is another series of more strategic issues that are addressed. These are issues identified as having significant, long-term impact on the future success of a library, and address questions such as: What are the pivotal information needs of the scholarly user and how they might change over for the foreseeable future? Should traditional Public Services be reconfigured to take full advantage of staff potential? What are the major options of service delivery over the next ten years? Can we determine when the library is successfully meeting its Public Service obligations and objectives? What are the economic implications of maintaining as well as introducing specific services? What added information on user behavior, service delivery options, staff capabilities, and operational costs should be added to the library's internal management process? And finally, Who should be involved in the act of considering service strategy options and priorities?

Each study is intended to deal with both the short-term operational aspects as well as the long-term strategic aspects. A critical element in managing this process, of course, is having a structure that is sufficiently flexible so that it can be used by a variety of institutions facing a variety of environments, and that allows comprehensive, systematic application of a wide range of complex yet interrelated issues.

The process that we are using is the assisted self-study process. It provides a systematic and structured approach to looking at public service issues. It encourages responsible staff involvement while maintaining the responsibility of library administrators for decision making. It also serves, we found out, to heighten staff commitment to the outcomes and to the implementation of the recommendations that are produced. We have also chosen the self-study form because that process has been used in other programs with a fair amount of success.

The design for the Public Services Program draws on OMS experience in designing self-studies in several different program areas—collections, management, preservation. There are four distinct elements in this framework: (1) an opening sequence of activities called situational analysis conducted by the participating library in order to determine whether they want to do the study, (2) a series of more general environmental studies conducted by a study team during the first phase of the study that leads to (3) the creation of five or more task forces to conduct specific analytical investigations and, finally, (4) the closure components in which the results are reviewed and put into a final report.

I will move briefly through an itemization of these specific activities. In the opening situational review, there is a need to assess the merits of the public services study and if there is a decision to participate, to identify the chairperson, assign the study team, and orient the study team. The decision process is a particularly interesting one in most situations; how do you decide to undertake complex efforts such as this which has an obvious impact on staff time, staff energy, and staff schedules. Clearly, some effort must be directed toward involving the staff in a discussion of merits and requirements of the study. Ultimately, an executive decision will be needed to provide necessary leadership.

Another set of issues relates to who should serve as chairman, who should be on the study team, and how to prepare the study team for doing a study of that sort. Clearly, it is important to have broad based representation in a study of this nature involving staff from all parts of the library and not restricted to people solely in the Public Service domain.

The next set of activities are related to the general environmental studies that are conducted. These investigations are sponsored by the study team and are normally conducted by individual on the team. Typically, about three months is devoted to this phase of the work. These initial studies are broadly based assessments of changes and developments in the research library environment. For example, a study of the current status of the university is completed that examines who has influence within the university, what decisions are being made, what program priorities exist, and where are those programs going? The purpose of this study is to assess changes taking place in the university that call for a response from Public Services. During this phase there is also an effort to look at the historical evolution of services, to identify current goals, objectives, and prevailing service philosophy, and finally, to inventory available services presently being offered, including location and rate of use of these services.

The result of the first phase is an interim report which describes the results of these environmental studies and outlines planning assumptions. This report also identifies the specific issues to be addressed by the task forces in the subsequent analytical phases.

At this point, I will describe the work included in the analytical phase of the study. We have six analytical modules presently in the manual. Any of the modules may be used or not be used by a particular study depending on the character, interest, and importance of the issues on that campus. The first analytical module is aimed at collecting, analyzing, and displaying improved information on user needs behavior and expectations. The second module examines the performance measures used in Public Services and assesses the success of Public Service Programs, particularly from the point of view of the need either to continue or discontinue present services or to add new services. There is a third module looking at the management issues—organization, staffing, management of Public Services. The fourth module concerns technology and Public Services, and frequently produces some of the most interesting, provocative information. A fifth module is related to how we communicate the character and nature of our service programs to users. Finally, a sixth module addresses facilities and space use.

Task forces typically operate for three to four months. They are assigned the responsibilities of collecting objective information and displaying it in a fashion that allows thoughtful, reflective analysis. Each group is then expected to produce ideas and recommendations for change. After the task forces complete the analytical studies, there is a final set of activities completed by the study team: reviewing the task force reports, identifying major themes, and developing an implementation strategy that would allow coherent attack on the issues identified, by the library's line administration.

As you can see as you go through this process, there are a number of people involved. They are expected to produce concrete, written products. Their efforts are intended to be both descriptive and prescriptive, and these efforts are all completed on a basis that is advisory in character to the library director. He or she is then, of course, the person that is expected to outline a response to specific recommendations and assign implementation responsibilities.

I might pause for a minute just to see if there are questions here on the self-study structure before we turn to look at some of the other experiences of the libraries working within this methodology to consider issues they found to be important. Again, the purpose of this panel presentation is to give the study participants an opportunity to describe and assess some of the issues and outcomes they have discovered through the course of their studies.

I must apologize at the outset of the panel discussions for two absences. Pat Swanson, who took a year's leave of absence from the University of Chicago to serve as project coordinator has pressing responsibilities from a previous commitment that prevent her from being here. Pat has had a major impact on both the development of the self-study process as well as playing a significant role in the conduct of each of the six studies. Lawrence Towner and Joel Samuels of the Newberry Library, the seventh test site, are also unable to be here again because of prior commitments.

Each of the panelists will spend 10 to 15 minutes discussing issues related to their situation and at the end of each of the six presentations, questions of clarifications that are specific to that institution will be welcomed. I would like to ask you to hold your more general questions on issues, lessons learned, problems encountered, and so forth, until the end when we will have a general question and answer period.

Speakers are going to be presented in alphabetical order by institution, which allows me to introduce the representative from Brown University, the University Librarian, Merrily Taylor.

PANEL: THE TEST LIBRARIES' EXPERIENCE

Brown University: Merrily Taylor

MS. TAYLOR: I am not going to talk a lot about what Brown did because you just heard that in Duane's introduction. What I do want to talk about for a moment or two some of the critical issues that we saw and some of the results that we have gained from doing the study.

The first thing I should say is that the timing was perfect for us at Brown and that was one of the reasons that we were very anxious to participate as a pilot institution. Not only was there a new University Librarian, there was also a new Assistant University Librarian for Public Services, so that neither one of us had anything invested in the way that things were done at Brown at that time. In addition to that, as I am sure most of you know, Brown has become very heavily involved in computerizing the campus. We are one of the so-called "Star Wars" universities, and for that reason it was clearly the time to begin looking at how that activity would affect the library. So, with that background as to why we chose to participate at this time, let me mention some of the issues.

One of the key concerns we had--in fact, probably one of the underlying concerns throughout the whole study--was the desire to deal with the specific problem of the library's image on the Brown campus. For various reasons, including a period through the 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s when the university had not been supporting the library in the way it might have, there had grown up a tradition of negativism on the campus about the library. That was in spite of the fact that in much of the outside world, it was perceived, in fact, as a very good library, with a number of great strengths. In addition, there had been considerable progress over the previous decade in dealing with some of the library's long-term problems, but because of this negativism, that progress was not perceived. The fact that the President of the university had increased support for the library recently was simply not recognized. People were misinformed about the severity of certain local problems, which are in fact common to most of us—for instance, the problem of lost or missing books; there seemed to be a perception that that was unique to Brown and, in fact, was worse at Brown than it was anyplace in the world. Obviously, all of this had an impact on staff morale, because if you continually tell people they are working in a dreadful place, after a while they begin to believe it. The negative image also had an impact on fund raising--who wants to give money to an institution that is dying on its feet?

For all these reasons, we believed that it was critical to deal with the negativism issue and, in fact, we had already been working on an outreach program—talking to faculty, trying to get the word out about what we saw as the real situation. So, when we heard about the pilot program, it seemed a perfect opportunity to begin dealing with the question of whether the negativism still existed, and if so, what we could do to determine the root source and correct it.

The way we addressed this issue through the study is very interesting. Brown runs a program for its exempt staff called the Management Development Program (MDP), wherein 15 to 20 people are taken into the program and put through a year-long process of learning certain management skills, and in addition, learning about how the university works. The people that tend to be in this program are middle-level managers from all parts of the university, and one of the things that they have to do when they are in their program is take on a year-long project. Well, it so happened that the person chairing our study team was also participating in MDP. We got a group of these outside managers to talk about the question of the library's image as part of the MDP process so they were working closely with the study team and doing quite an intensive survey of their own.

We also did a user survey that went out to over 3,000 people; 1,000 replies came back. In the survey we dealt with users' perceptions about the library and services they were getting from the library. What did we learn? For one thing, we learned, somewhat to our surprise, that during the period of the study and the period immediately preceding it, the image problem had reversed itself to an amazing degree. It seemed to be in great part a direct result of having asked people for their opinions and their criticisms. In other words, the very action of going out and saying, "We understand you are not happy with us. Please tell us why so we can do something about it," seemed to make people feel much better and, of course, it gave us an agenda for future action.

The remaining image problem that existed, and some did and still does exist, was as a result of no information rather than of incorrect information. In other words, we discovered that a great many of our users had no idea that the library did database searching, had never heard of it, did not know it was available, did not know that you could request that a book be ordered for you. Clearly, we identified some areas where we simply had to get information out to our users and potential users.

Several specific things were done. First, we established a Public Service Council, which is made up of people who cut across all of our Public Service units, some of which are not in Public Service per se. That group has been established to work on common problems that go across the library. The other approach was to renew an already existing commitment to a very active library publications program. We had already succeeded in establishing a publications fund. As a result of the self-study, we ended up with 16 specific publications, which are in the process of being produced and will be ready in September, to target some of the areas where it was clear that people did not know about the services we had to offer. So, from the point of view of that library image project, I believe the self-study was well worth it, both in the results we got and just because the fact of doing it helped with the image.

One of the other things we believed was important to study was the organization of our service departments. The present organization was the result of a reorganization carried out during the administration of one of my distinguished predecessors. Even the best organization can be affected by time and change, so we wanted to see if the existing structure was still working well in providing service to the community. We also felt it very important to involve staff at all levels in looking at that question because people needed and expected advice in the changes that were going to affect their daily lives. Without that involvement, you may not get their cooperation if you then have to reorganize.

Several things resulted from this investigation. There were recommendations on physical reorganization, for instance, moving our reserves operation from the second floor down to the first floor where it could be more accessible and kept open. There was a recommendation that the Serials Department be given additional responsibility for microforms. There was a recommendation to merge the government documents and reference desk to provide better service coverage, and there was a further recommendation to move the Government Documents Department, which is now in Technical Services, into the Public Service Division. That last recommendation is under study because it would require so many specific steps.

One of the recommendations that was not accepted was to merge reference and interlibrary loan. One of the reasons we decided not to do that is because the problems that the task force identified turned out to be problems really of communication between individuals, not problems inherent in the organization. That is one of the things you find out through this entire process.

Finally, we also confirmed the fact that we needed to review the organization within our Special Collections Division and that is now in progress as a sort of mini-Public Service self-study entirely within Special Collections.

One other thing that we did through the study was confirm suspected trouble spots. We had, through simple observation, word-of-mouth talk to students and faculty, a pretty good idea of the fact that the Brown community was not really joyful about our photocopy operation or about our Reserve operation. Interestingly enough, when we got the feedback from the survey, although the overwhelming majority of the users rated library services above satisfactory or highly satisfactory, more than 41% of them were unhappy with the situation of the photocopiers. Again, that gave us some specific information on where to move forward.

You noticed I have not talked a lot about technology. We had a technology group working and they did have some success in giving us some general recommendations. However, the whole implementation of technology at Brown is so deeply embedded in what we were doing that while that group was able to set general agendas (such as the need of the staff at all levels for more familiarity with new information technologies), they were not able to deal very well with the impact of technology on specific areas or even with issues like how will the online catalog affect Public Service, because that was being dealt with in so many other ways.

Overall, we were extremely pleased with the study as a process and I believe it was extremely valuable. First, we got people working closely together in a complex project, which is something that not all of the individuals had done. We had over 40 people involved out of a staff of about 220, so it was an extensive effort and a lot of these people had never gone through anything like that before. They learned, among other things, about the complexities of making changes in a large organization and the fact that other departments do not always see it your way and furthermore, that they have good reasons for not seeing it your way, and that you have to work through those differences of opinions. That is just not as simple as saying, "Well, why doesn't someone make so and so do this?"

In most of our staffs now, there is a great commitment to an interest in participatory management. Our staff learned through this study that participatory management is a desirable and wonderful thing, but also that it requires a great deal of hard work. Participatory management in most large libraries means committees. This study more or less said, "This is how participatory management works, and we will give it to you. But be prepared for what that then means in terms of our schedule and what happens to our routine, day-to-day work." I believe that that was very valuable for the staff.

We ended up with 178 final recommendations, weeded down from more than 500. Many of those were very, very specific (such as establish a Public Service Council) and some were very general, but a large number of them have already been implemented. We have two recommendations that are quite complex on which we have further committees working on how they should be implemented. One was the physical reorganization of the Rockefeller Library, which is going to have to wait now for about a year until we bring up the online catalog.

University of California, Riverside: Joan Chambers

MR. WEBSTER: The next speaker is from the University of California in Riverside, a much different situation, but a library that is growing rapidly with a very active interest in the public service domain. I would like to introduce the University Librarian from Riverside, Joan Chambers.

MS. CHAMBERS: Thank you, Duane. It is very interesting to hear what these other people have done. I had not talked to Merrily in detail, but I was interested in the new ideas and how they were both alike and different from ours.

It has now been two and a half years since the Department Heads Group and the Librarians Association at the University of California at Riverside considered the recommendation of one of their colleagues that UCR apply to be a pilot library in the Public Services Self Study. After assessing both the advantages and disadvantages, they determined that the advantages won, and that they were willing to cope with the disadvantages. When Riverside was selected, there was widespread enthusiasm about the project. Although about 25% of the staff participated on either the Study Team or a task force, that represented only half of those who had expressed an interest. Exploring all of the aspects of the study from the total staff time expended, to the effectiveness of the self-study process, to staff growth and development, to results and further implications, is occurring and will continue to occur as conference papers are presented and articles are published.

Related issues are also being examined. They include: (1) the complexity of public services, (2) the changing nature of research and of scholarship, and (3) the rapid developments in technology that are affecting the source and delivery of information. While I will not explore any of these issues today, they were all considered during our self study.

Today, I will share with you some selected glimpses of what motivated the study at UCR, a few of the results to date, and a few of the key issues that were addressed.

First, the motivation. We felt the need for reliable user information on a current and ongoing basis, for assurance that we were responding to the actual needs as expressed by faculty and students and not solely to our assumptions or perceptions of their needs, and, for a procedure for reaching a consensus with them on priorities for public services now and in the future. Once the service needs and priorities were established, we wanted: (1) to determine the most effective organizational structure for providing service; (2) to take advantage of the developments in technology; (3) to redefine traditional roles if necessary; (4) to establish performance and measures of effectiveness; and (5) to provide the staff training required to achieve these objectives. Finally, we wanted to establish an ongoing process that would allow our services to continue to evolve in response to continuing changes—changes in faculty and student needs, in sources of information, in technology, and also in the availability of resources to support our services.

Now, on to some selected glimpses of the results to date. The Study Team's report was submitted a year ago and responsibility for each recommendation has been assigned. Progress toward achieving our objectives is variable. We have obtained extensive data regarding our current services. We have expanded our communication with faculty, thus improving our ability to receive and respond to their feedback regarding the effectiveness of our services in meeting their needs. We do not yet have in place a procedure for reaching consensus with them on priorities for services.

Our organizational structure for public services has changed somewhat and a few roles have been redefined. The application of technology to the provision of services is moving at a fast pace. The establishment of performance and measures of effectiveness is moving at a slow pace. Progress in the area of staff training and development is meeting our expectations. Finally, there is an enthusiastic commitment to the self-study process as the method for continuing to respond to changes that affect public services.

Now, the most interesting part—the glimpses of a few key issues addressed by the study. In preparing this report, I reviewed the numerous documents that resulted from the study. Unfortunately, most of you will see only the final reports. I say "unfortunately" because the real substance of the study is contained in the preliminary documents and especially in the task force reports. I was impressed again with the significance of the topics that were addressed, with the creative thinking that they generated, and with both the quantity and quality of the information that was produced.

One of the key issues addressed at Riverside was the need to obtain reliable information on the effectiveness of our current services. The charge to the Task Force on Service Performance and Service Needs was to review, measure, and analyze our public services programs in terms of their strengths and weaknesses, and to collect data from all of our user constituencies. With this as a guide, the task force developed four questions to aid them in designing their surveys:

1) Are current services optimal for UCR's diverse user groups?

2) Do service gaps and problems exist? If so, are they local to one library or general to all?

3) Do faculty and students have service needs that we are not meeting?

4) Do they find our collections adequate?

The task force administered three major surveys to: (1) faculty and graduate students, (2) undergraduate students, and (3) non-affiliated users. They then conducted an extensive analysis of the data. The survey results were useful throughout the self study and formed the basis for many of the recommendations that appear in the final report. Equally important, however, is how useful they have been to us, and to the campus administration, since the study was completed. We now have current, reliable, comprehensive, and organized data conveniently available. The data can be manipulated and analyzed in different ways as new questions arise. They can be aggregated to include entire constituencies or disaggregated. Already, the data have become a valuable by-product of the study and will provide a benchmark for future analysis.

A second task force administered two surveys to library employees. The first related to their responsibility, training, and supervision. The second covered the provision of library services. Again, the survey data will have a useful life which extends beyond the self-study.

The Task Force on Technology and Public Services probed some highly complex issues. The following questions, which guided their work, will give you some flavor of their reports.

1) What are the primary technological developments that have revolutionized the methods of processing information?

2) What are the implications for academic libraries of changes in information technology?

3) What has been, and will be, the impact of this technology on library services?

4) How can academic libraries continue to monitor technological developments in order to make intelligent use of technology to enhance the library's Public Service Programs?

During the next few years, the information and recommendations in this report will help guide us in using technology to help us to be more efficient and effective in meeting the information needs of our scholars.

The last issue I will mention is "the future." The task force that examined The Role of Library in the Future could be characterized as a "think tank." Their working papers examined such diverse, compelling, and provocative questions as:

1) What is the future of the university?

2) Will the academic library be a purveyor of knowledge or a broker of information?

3) What are the social, economic, and legal effects of the application of technology to information?

4) What is the effect in research and scholarship if information is considered a commodity?

5) Will access to information become a self-serve operation, similar to the automated teller at the bank?

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to call your attention to the several papers on the Public Service Self Study that were presented at the Third National ACRL Conference in Seattle last year. In one paper, the chair of the Riverside Study Team examined the role of the self-study process in staff development.

While the change to date in public services at Riverside cannot be characterized as "leaps forward," I hope my selected glimpses have provided you with some examples of the many benefits that have accrued as a result of our participation in the study. Two that may not have been apparent are first, a willingness to modify existing services and to establish new ones, and second, the understanding that additional resources may not be available and the willingness to reallocate existing resources to achieve our objectives.

While there is yet a good lot to be accomplished, I am confident that the self study has contributed to our individual and collective capabilities to ensure that our services will continue to evolve in response to a changing environment.

Columbia University: Patricia Battin

MR. WEBSTER: Our next presenter is from Columbia University—Patricia Battin.

MS. BATTIN: I always feel like somewhat of a fraud in circumstances like this. This study was conducted and directed by Paula Kaufman and I watched from the side lines. The report that follows is really her report which I am delivering.

We exercised a little academic freedom at Columbia and changed the guidelines slightly. Our decision was not to identify or expend a great deal of time on current nitty-gritty operational problems, but rather to focus on activities and plans that we believe we must undertake in order to meet the needs of the future.

As a first step, we articulated a series of basic assumptions that we believed were important to publicize to make sure that our entire community understood and either accepted or rejected those assumptions. Quite often, we find that the library is going in one direction and our clientele is going in another based on some very substantive misunderstandings. Our ten assumptions have to do with the history and tradition of Columbia University, the projected nature of the student body over the next ten or so years, the level of resources that will not be available to the library, and the increased services that we predict will be necessary.

Our study came up with a total of 80 recommendations, which I will not discuss today. What I want to talk about are three key issues that we believe characterize the study from our point of view. As I said, since we did determine that we wanted to focus on the needs of the future, that meant that we had to expend a good deal of time in working and discussing with our scholars what they saw as changes in the ways they would be doing their research and teaching their courses. So, the first set of issues are involved with the identification of changes in user needs. The second set following from that, concern the need for continuing planning mechanisms in order to explore those changes, anticipate them, and implement the necessary responses. The third area is the issue of equity of services.

Let me just spend a little time on the changes that our scholars anticipate in their work habits. We spent a good deal of time in actual dialogue with the scholars. These are several of the important changes:

1. The creation and use of machine-readable data files will increase substantially, expanding scholarly output as such files are copied and analyzed for purposes secondary to those for which they were originally created; as they allow the gathering, manipulation, and analysis of data in ways not possible before; and as they allow the verification of original research results by re-analysis of primary material such as field notes, interviews, and so forth.

2. Certain kinds of data will be available only in machine-readable form and will never enter the archives of print materials stored in libraries. A portion of this material has never been generally available to scholars before (e.g. informal notes, telephone conversations, etc.).

3. Text editing capabilities will simplify the production of books and articles. The ease of producing scholarly reports may increase their production.

4. The development of software may be considered part of a scholar's contribution to his or her field of research and may be disseminated as are other research results.

5. For the foreseeable future, the final results of scholarly research will continue to be published in monographs and traditional refereed journals. There is no indication at present that scholars are prepared to accept electronic formats as a substitute for printed materials. This means libraries will need to assume incremental, not substitutional costs, as they make materials available simultaneously in more than one format.

6. The creation of CAI programs, dissemination of lecture notes as by-products of electronic files, and the creation of files of materials required for reading, formerly placed in library reserve collections, may facilitate fulfillment of the faculties' instructional responsibilities and reduce the time needed to meet them.

7. It is likely that well within five years, networks of scholars working within the same narrow research areas will establish and maintain files of full text articles, preprints, informal communications of research results or ideas, and bibliographic citations and abstracts

relevant to their subject interest.

8. The creation and marketing of software for personal computers will allow the easy development of personal bibliographic files for the control of personal libraries, the creation of bibliographies for purposes of citation, and the gathering of references to introduce students to the literature of a field.

9. University-wide networks of electronic workstations for students and faculty will facilitate the instructional process as well as intra- and inter-university scholarly communication.

Other conversations with Columbia faculty members confirmed many of these anticipated changes and also emphasized the concerns of many scholars, particularly those in humanities, that the new technology would eliminate their ability to browse materials. A major cause of their trepidation is the fact that the scholar does not necessarily know for what he or she is looking.

In addition, a lack of software of the necessary quality is a current, distinct deterrent to our scholars today. The capacity to customize access is important, and they stress that the available technology should be as flexible as possible. Our scholars and students want a variety of information and communication resources through one source and they want to be able to use it as easily as possible. That naturally led us into a recognition that we have a great need to improve and expand our planning mechanisms to continue to keep up with these changes, and to identify and implement our responses to them. Columbia has had a planning office since 1970, but we recognized, during the course of this study, that we need to intensify our efforts in this direction.

The issue of equity of services became apparent throughout all of the activities of the subcommittees involved in this study. Traditional research is changing in different ways and, as the information needs of persons working in different disciplines continue to diverge and as the number of sources and types of information available continue to increase, the need for a growing multiplicity of information resources and services offered by research institutions will become more urgent.

Research librarians face a critical question, "How can an equitable set of services be provided to user groups whose basic service needs will differ radically?" We have no answer to that. That, I believe, is probably the primary issue that arose from the study. It is being looked at campus-wide because I believe it is one of the most urgent issues that face us now.

As I said, we had about 80 recommendations that came out of this study and those are being dealt with by various operating units. We are working in three areas as a result of that study. First, we have set aside one meeting a month of our senior library staff to reconstitute themselves as a planning council to address some of these issues from a strategic point of view. Second, we have set up a Blue Sky Committee composed of front-line people—by the way, these are not the people sitting back in the office, but the people working daily with the users—and we have asked them to take the following as their charge: "What do you see in five or ten years with no increase in resources? How will we serve these growing needs? What services should be dropped? What services need to be added and how do we determine the value of services and subsidies that come along with tuition or with an appointment to the faculty? What levels of staff will we have?" These are the kinds of questions we have asked that committee to consider in the context of the study.

The last activity I want to mention preceded the study, has gathered momentum throughout, and the logic of it has been again reinforced and confirmed by what we have found out. That activity is our notion of a Scholarly Information Center, which is a merging of the computer center and the libraries in an effort to meet the individual needs of the scholar regardless of through which door he or she comes.

Michigan State University: Richard E. Chapin

MR. WEBSTER: Now I would like to then turn to our token Midwest representative. You notice we have been going from coast to coast, but here is Richard E. Chapin, Director of Libraries at Michigan State University.

MR. CHAPIN: The public service concerns at Michigan State are different than those at Columbia, Riverside, or Brown. We are faced with 40,000 students: 10,000 new people come to East Lansing each year. That is a problem in bibliographic instruction! In spite of—or because of—the numbers, our building becomes smaller and smaller.

The decision to participate in the Public Service Study was not taken lightly. We have a staff that is too small and the questions were, "Do we have time to do this? Can we take nine months of our time in order to tell Chapin how to run the library?" 80% of the staff volunteered. This is the first OMS Self-Study in which we have participated. We were reluctant, but if we were going to do it, the Public Services Study was preferred to other areas because public services at Michigan State are very good.

Now for the statistics. We had 76 recommendations: 32 of them have been completed, ten are almost completed, 26 are ongoing, four have been ignored to date, and four were rejected. Those ignored are good recommendations, but the logistics are bad. For instance, it was recommended that we have an internal job exchange, so that catalogers could work reference and vice versa. This is a good idea, but we do not have sufficient staff to implement it. There was a recommendation to establish a Library Service Committee to review all other campus libraries. It was rejected. I would rather not know about some things.

The key recommendation was dictated by space needs. We had an Undergraduate Library and a Research Library. And holding it up was the Science Library on the ground floor. On the first floor are common services such as circulation and reference. To understand the problem, you must know we are out of space. The Science Library no longer had room to grow. And that became the one predominant force behind the study.

The only way we could make any changes, it seemed, and I did not agree with this one to begin with, was to do away with the Undergraduate Library. It was proposed that we take the undergraduate collections and merge the books and periodicals with the general collection. Only then would we have some space to improve services.

There were two of us who thought that the demise of the Undergraduate Library was a bad recommendation. At a general staff meeting I could not convince many others that the Undergraduate Library should be retained. When the vote is 60 to 2 against you, even I believe in participatory management. So we did away with the Undergraduate Library. Once that decision was made, other physical changes could be proposed.

The undergraduate collection was weeded, many titles were sold at a book sale, and others were merged in with the general collection. The Science Library was moved. That made it possible to move Documents. Unlike Riverside, we separated Documents from Reference. One thing we all learned in the Public Service Study, as we went through the process, was that each library has its own problems. The Riverside problem and solution worked for Riverside. We had another problem: we needed space. So, during the summer we closed out the Undergraduate Library, moved the Science Library to the Undergrad space, and moved Documents to the space opened by the Science move.

The next question was what do we do about services? What do we do with the 10,000 new people each year that come to Michigan State University? How do we explain our library system? How do we assist the user to find the right answer or the right book? With 40,000 students, in a rather highly centralized facility, it is difficult.

The Study Team, of course, was concerned with services as well as space. It was recommended that Reference and Information be combined. We had a very good information service area. People come in the front door, bump into the information desk, and this is where we sort them out: "you go this way," "you go that way," and "you go back to the dorm." We would direct most of the people to reference or to the Undergraduate Library.

We rejected the recommendation of combining Information with General Reference. We took the idea and concept, however, and went a bit further with it. We will have an Information/Reference (Info/Ref) point and a more specialized Social Science/Humanities Reference (SS/HR) area. Info/Ref will be the place where most of the users will come for information. It will be the first level of reference service for all and the final level for most. We will have a free database searching area where students come if they want five articles or five references in order to get going on their term papers.

The next stage was to establish the Social Science/Humanities Reference area to provide a more specialized reference service. The staff is talking about client-centered reference services, quality circles, and things like that. We will take a new look at giving better reference and information services to the faculty in social sciences and humanities, to graduate students, and to advanced undergraduates. The whole process may well lead us back to the old divisional library concept. If so, it might well work the next time around.

Many of the recommendations of the Study Team have evolved into something other than the original recommendation. For instance, it was suggested that we provide phone service operation so that students and faculty could renew books by phone. This was kicked around for a period of four or five months and now we have an electronic bulletin board. The Bulletin Board is a personal computer hooked up to a phone. Users with access to terminal can leave a message for a renewal of a book, for photoduplication services, for delivering materials to the faculty offices, and for interlibrary loans. It is a rather neat program. Phone renewals for students? Still under review.

In the area of staffing, there were a number of recommendations. One recommendation, rejected, was that Public Services need "more staff." We had specific recommendations for bibliographic instruction coordinators—one in Science, one in Social Science/Humanities Reference, and one in Information/Reference. We had a recommendation for personnel librarian, for someone to do staff development, and for someone to do fund-raising. The total requests, like annual requests at budget time, far exceed our resources. We will move some people around, we will add some positions, but when you get right down to it, most of the changes will be by recognizing the public services responsibilities involved in the Collection Development Department. Defining an effective role for the Collection Development staff in providing public services will be necessary if we are to carry out the spirit of the Public Service Study.

Many career paths at Michigan State require individuals to have experience in supervision and evaluation for promotion to higher positions. The Study Team recommended that we identify individuals to coordinate activities such as training, database searching, and bibliographic instruction. The coordinators will make the activities happen and they will gain some administrative experience in the process.

Another aspect of staffing is the role of others than librarian at service desks. We are considering the role of the paraprofessional and the clerical/technical staff. We have said all along, "When you talk to somebody at the reference desk, you talk to a librarian." Is it necessary that all users talk to a librarian? Can the user talk to someone else? Can students do database searching or is that something magic that only librarians can do? The Public Service Study has given us the opportunity to look at a number of staffing patterns.

In considering services for the user, you cannot ignore collection development. Some wanted us to undertake a Collection Analysis Project. I do not recommend two ARL projects in succeeding years. Give yourself a break! One thing we will do is begin working on the North American Collection Inventory Project. We have had training from one of our colleagues from the University of Michigan. This will be one of the first steps in reviewing collection development at Michigan State.

In my bottom desk drawer there is a well-used copy of Machiavelli's The Prince, where it is stated that "nothing is more difficult to bring about than to create new order of things..." The study proved to the staff that Machiavelli is for real. They realize it is difficult to bring about a new order of things. You cannot dictate change. You need and must have good involvement of the staff. When you have the involvement, it makes it a little difficult to ignore or to change recommendations. Fortunately, our staff knows that "participatory" does not necessarily mean that we vote. It is an advisory system that encourages staff members to participate in the decision-making process, knowing full well that one person will assume responsibility for the final decision.

As a result of the study, we have a more informed staff, one with improved problem-solving skills. And there is one other benefit: my staff members have a more informed director.

University of North Carolina: James Govan

MR. WEBSTER: The next speaker is the University Librarian at the University of North Carolina, James Govan.

MR. GOVAN: We had a unique circumstance at North Carolina in that when we began we had a new building just about due to open, and we moved into it in the middle of the study. That had certain advantages and certain disadvantages, so in some ways our study is quite different from the others, though many elements were essentially the same. During the spring and summer of 1983, we did the background work and papers. Then from November through February 1984, we were in the various stages of the move. We then picked up the study after we got into the building, so that interruption did pose certain problems.

I was very surprised by the background papers; I thought the staff did an extremely fine job there. Some of the challenges put to them in the requirements for that background work were not very inviting. There was one paper that virtually called for a recent history of the cosmos, and the task force did very well with it, much better than I thought they would have done or that I could have done.

From the beginning, all participants operated under the premise that recommendations were to be made within the context that there would be no additional budgetary support for their implementation. I believe the other speakers have indicated that also. It was not altogether remembered; but it was largely adhered to, and I believe, again, the staff did a very good job on restricting costs.

Now, when we began to sit down and talk about issues, one of the things that was pushed to the fore was internal communication. We had just had two rather extensive examinations of our communication system within the past five years. So when it was raised, I said, "The staff would not be interested in this because we have already been questionnaired to death about that matter." Well, as it turned out, that was the most popular topic that we addressed.

It reminds me of the story about one of our former colleagues. When he took a new job, he was told that communication was the biggest problem in the library, and he worked steadily on that for five years. When he left, they told him that was the biggest problem in the library. I believe it is just one of those things that is with you all of the time. Perhaps the first thing you ought to do before you attempt something like this is to set up good communication. The task force recommended several things that we were already doing, which shows you, I guess, that there was a problem.

Communication with the administration inevitably came out on top of the list. It was the area that needed more help, by universal agreement, than any of the others. I, frankly, was shocked. On the other hand, they did find out that within the departmental groups and between the divisional organizations, there was not as much communication going on as there should have been or as the staff would have liked to have seen. As a result, aside from the benefit of the process, we also identified some areas in which we could provide some additional avenues and improve the internal communication.

The next area was user needs, and like everyone else, we conducted a survey. We found out a lot of things that were useful to all of the task forces and this group generously shared that information in mid-process with the other task forces. The community gave us as a library—and this is undergraduates, graduates, and faculty—a 96% approval rate. This gratifying rate was confirmed later in a survey made for the university's accreditation, in which we received something like 94.5%, the highest rating, I believe, for a research resource on campus.

Again, as I said, you can take a lot of satisfaction from such results, but one of the things that concerned me about it is the extent of what the community knows about the possibilities for a library today. I believe that the faculties do not associate technology with libraries. It is not expected from libraries, so the fact that the library is perhaps not on the cutting edge does not reflect poorly upon us. I have been struggling now for two years to get my faculty administrative board to deal with the issue of the acquisition of the databases, and it has been agonizing for them and for me, partly because it is difficult since each discipline is different. They have had a very difficult time finding a role for the library that you can generalize across all disciplines. We have a research institute that does a very fine job with locally held databases in social sciences. But when you begin to deal with different disciplines and you take out the social sciences and health sciences, you are left with something of a struggle with what is left.

The third task force had to do with organization. Those of you who came to Chapel Hill in October 1983 may remember that large reference room in the building, and that it housed two different reference departments, one for humanities and one for social science and business. When we began this study, I raised the questions that had been raised several times over the course of the library's history about merging those two departments. What I really had hoped for, since that topic is highly volatile on our campus, was that the study would examine that possibility with the idea that the task force involved could fall back from it somewhat and work out coordinated service. Well, unfortunately, that issue got very complicated and very heated, and it dominated the work of that task force; they spent about 80% of their time dealing with the merger of the reference rooms and did not get, in my opinion, the best results. But in the end, they recommended that the two reference departments not be merged.

I believe the study gave the staff a number of new techniques and a lot of people became better informed about areas of the library previously unfamiliar to them. But essentially in terms of reorganizing or suggesting any reorganizational pattern, I do not think it really did much more for us. The task force on organization looked at the business of flattening the hierarchy as a result of technology. In the end they concluded that there is not a model yet that seems to be viable enough for us to try to attempt at this time.

On technology, there were a number of specific recommendations about staff training, especially the variety of training required from the simple matters of learning how to use microcomputers and word processors to develop software. The task force also made some recommendations to staff in regards to training the public. They recommended, among a number of other things, the acquisition of a laser disc displayer for video tapes with microprocessing capacity with an interaction with microcomputers. They got on to this through the health science library and we now have a laser disc displayer. It has a demonstration disc with the Philadelphia Orchestra. Otherwise, it is sitting there waiting for somebody to develop some library programs. So, if anybody here has anything good, let me know.

As for my general conclusions, they are not markedly different from anybody else's. I believe the process was good. We learned about our users, and they learned a lot about us. It was well worth it; but Lord knows, anybody going into it should recognize that it takes a tremendous amount of time and effort; no one should be innocent of that fact.

But, as the others have said, I believe more than progress or change—and I am not sure that historically we are at a point where radical changes are in order, because I am not sure we know the proper direction yet—it has given us an agenda for the next several years in the way Pat suggested they have at Columbia. Just to give you some idea, as others have, in regard to numbers of recommendations, we had 219 from the task forces and 132 of those were acted on either in the course of the study or as they were being formulated. Sixty-six recommendations from the study team were finally passed on to the administrative group and of those, 55, or 83%, have already been acted on, implemented, or are in progress.

Temple University: James Myers

MR. WEBSTER: The last institution represented is Temple University. Temple provided some special opportunities for us to test the flexibility and adaptive character of the self-study process. The study began under the leadership of Joseph Boisse, but he left the project in the hands of Sharon Hogan when he went to the University of California, Santa Barbara. Sharon did a most capable job, but then left to go to Louisiana State University, leaving our next speaker—the new director, James Myers—to implement the results.

MR. MYERS: It is true that the study was conducted under severe circumstances, but this serves to increase my faith in the organizations that we create. Joe left in the second month, and he was sadly missed. Sharon left in the tenth month, and she is missed. Nevertheless, the study went on and it was completed. It took twelve months rather than the six that were planned. There were also two chairpersons. Sharon started out as chair, then when Joe left, she appointed another chair who, shortly after that, took on a different job about ten miles outside of town.

As you might expect, arising out of circumstances something like these, the recommendations of this study were very specific. The study team did not address grand issues because of the fact that they were in transition. We are still not as far along with addressing the recommendations as the others from whom you have heard. I have been at Temple but a month and the recommendations tend to be very local in content. Let me try to characterize the kinds of issues that were dealt with, then I will stop because I know a lot less about this study than the others who have spoken.

Organizational issues were considered. The organization, in fact the job descriptions of the director and the deputy director, were addressed. The staff wanted clearer job descriptions. They suggested a committee structure for the library. It is not perfect, but is not a bad structure either. They suggested positions that are needed; these needs are being addressed.

The second major area was statistics and surveys. The study suggested standardizing statistics and centralizing responsibility for statistics and surveys. A third area was user service, addressing issues relating to computerized literature searching, bibliographic instruction, and the coordination of reference service. Under the rubric of materials access, the study considered maintenance, replacement, intra-library loan, and the use of the automated circulation system to improve these areas.

Other subjects addressed were automation, the current online circulation system, online catalogs, serials control, document delivery, office automation, and non-print media. In the area of staffing, the study discussed and made recommendations on staff training and staff development. On the subject of communication, they suggested the need for manuals, lists, more manuals, more lists, and taped messages for people who are calling on the telephone. Public relations issues such as newsletters, signs, and electronic message systems were covered. Finally, on facilities and equipment, the report gives me twelve months to install new elevators in the building and a bit longer to achieve a new building and improve maintenance of audiovisual equipment and photocopy equipment.

Although I made light of some of them, I believe the recommendations are remarkably useful. As I have said, we will be addressing them and I have promised an initial response to the staff by the 21st of June. I have no way to judge how well the staff worked together, but I believe they work together better now. There were more than 40 people directly involved in the study and they managed to involve almost everyone else in the library. The process itself was very valuable.

DISCUSSION

MR. WEBSTER: At this point, I would like to offer some observations on the six presentations, and then open the floor to you for additional comments or questions.

My first observation is that a common concern to all the participating institutions is building a better understanding of the changing nature of scholarly research, communication, and individual work habits. The character of the scholarly world is changing. Research librarians need to be at the forefront of studying and understanding these changes.

A second observation concerns pressing need to develop more effective communication links with our user communities. Every study has examined ways and means of enhancing research librarians' working relationship with scholars. Clearly, an improved exchange of information develops mutual understandings and support that benefit both parties.

My third observation is that all of these studies apparently developed a certain balance between dealing with the short-range, operational issues and the longer range issues concerning future prospects for research librarians, which are harder to define and influence. The study process has proven useful for problem solving and development of longer term public service strategies.

Another observation concerns the development of staff and understanding of public service issues. All studies were characterized by a fair amount of discussion relating to the success of existing services and the need to introduce new services. There is substantial interest in changing the mix of services, working both within the traditional models of library service and experimenting more aggressively with some of the new technologies.

Finally, I observe the evolutionary character of the organizational changes coming out of these studies. Rather than a radical departure, these studies represent transition efforts. They are vehicles for moving certain organizational capabilities from where they are today and preparing them to address some emerging information needs for the future world of scholarship. I will now pause and invite comments or questions from the floor.

MR. FORTH (Pennsylvania State University): I found the papers very interesting but somewhat familiar. Unfortunately, I missed your introductory remarks, and perhaps you have already addressed my concern. Except for the fact that we are talking about changing habits and methods of working in academia, due to the increasing prevalance of computers, after listening to our colleagues, how do these studies differ from the MRAP study we did about eight or nine years ago? I am hearing identical things: 40 people involved, 50 people involved examining the structure, being more sensitive, more communication, different communication. That is all very familiar. Maybe I do not have to do one of these studies—I have already done it.

MR. WEBSTER: That is a fair question. There is indeed a great deal of similarity between the methodologies involved with the earlier management study and the new Public Services Study. I covered this as part of the earlier discussions on the methodology of the Public Services Study, but your questions gives me a chance to elaborate on the differences between the two studies.

With the public services study we are trying to highlight a set of issues. The issues are related to the way we provide design, introduce, and manage the Public Services program. The issues as a result are different from the issues related to management structure, supervision processes, and executive leadership. The techniques and tools that we are developing to focus on these service related issues are different. The methodology however is the same. It is the self-study process that involves in a systematic fashion staff`study of organizational concerns.

Another way of responding to your question is to invite another member of the panel to comment on the relationship between a management study and a Public Services Study. Columbia University Library completed an extensive examination of their management structure 15 years ago, and has now participated in the Public Services Study as a way of building on that earlier investigation. Pat, would you like to comment on this relationship?

MS. BATTIN: In response to your point, Stuart, I was not present at the Booz-Hamilton study 15 years ago. The process is somewhat similar, but I believe that the emphasis is quite different. In the Columbia Public Services Study, we focused on identifying and addressing the needs of scholars from outside the library rather than the needs of staff from inside of the library. We were trying to identify what was going on out there, how the information needs were changing, and then exploring how we would respond to these changes rather than starting from the inside and working out.

MR. WEBSTER: Are there other questions from the floor?

MR. BESANT (Linda Hall Library): I wonder if any of you have continued to try to conduct on a regular basis any of the user studies that were furnished as part of the project?

MS. BATTIN: We have a commitment to do another survey within the next couple of years. We want to compare the results from the prior survey to see if the changes we have made have, in fact, been perceived by the people for whom we were making the changes. We will continue that on a regular basis.

I do not know if we will continue surveys on a regular basis, but we are looking for new ways that we can develop better communication channels with our users than we have had in the past.

MR. WEBSTER: Additional comments from the panel?

MS. CHAMBERS: Because of the scope of our original survey—it was several pages long and was sent virtually to every student and faculty member on the campus—we would have to let some time go by before we ask them to undergo such an extensive survey again. But certainly our intent is to use this as a basis and benchmark for future surveys.

MR. WEBSTER: Any other questions?

MR. DOUGHERTY (University of Michigan): I believe somebody mentioned user satisfaction surveys. Fifteen years ago, doing a study in school, I got an enormous response from people who were very happy with what the library was doing. We did a follow-up inquiry involving half-hour interviews, and two facts emerged.

First of all, the vast majority of the people who responded to the survey actually did not know what they were talking about when they talked about the services. Secondly, often they had not used the services. For example, interlibrary loans: 80% thought it was great, but 80% had never used it. Users then began to express dissatisfaction, and we concluded from all of this that the library is the beneficiary of the so-called halo effect. I wonder if your surveys really dug into this, or is it possible that you really are enjoying that halo effect? I do not mean my statement as a criticism.

MR. GOVAN: The halo is liable to come crashing down upon our ears pretty quickly if the public changes its demands and expects things from us that we are not, perhaps, prepared to give. We have all these data on a series of tapes and we hope to keep analyzing those tapes. But I do not believe that we are in any sense inclined to be complacent on the basis of the survey results.

Your example could also operate the other way. You may find that the same percentage of the people who think that a service is lousy also never use it.

MS. TAYLOR: We had a section for written comments on our survey and kept these written comments separate. It was quite clear from the nature of many of the comments that people responding used the services under which they had made a comment. What we found disturbing was the number of people who did not know what services existed. Another point we confirmed was the advantage of being in a smaller environment. There is enough word-of-mouth response in other ways that tends to confirm what might come in on a survey.

MR. WEBSTER: I might add there are at least four different methods for assessing user needs and responses that are offered in the program itself. The test libraries tailored them to their own needs. Those new instruments are now also part of the resources available from the office.

MS. CHAMBERS: We were very pleased with our survey. To begin with, we got professional help in designing the survey. For every question regarding an opinion or evaluation of services, we had to first see what their first level of interaction was: "Never heard of it before," to "Use it frequently,"—that sort of thing—so I believe that that can deal with some of those problems.

MR. WEBSTER: Any other questions at this point? Let me urge you to look at the full reports from these several studies, as well as reports from the sponsored research projects. They have much more information than we were able to provide today.

I want also to thank the Public Services Project Advisory Committee who worked throughout the two years to provide help on this program. The members of that committee included: Harold Billings, Robin Downes, Jay Lucker, Susan Martin, Robert Miller, Merrily Taylor, and Paul Vassallo. Again, I appreciate their support.

Finally, I want to underscore that the Public Services Self-Study is simply one method of generating ideas and analysis to respond to the challenge of improving research library public services. We believe it is a process that better prepares libraries for an uncertain future.

BUSINESS MEETING

Special Report: NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

MR. TALBOT: In starting off this session, I would like to read to you a resolution that was adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of Research Libraries, on May 14, 1985. It is a statement of support and gratitude for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and it reads as follows:

> Whereas, there is substantial evidence that the intellectual heritage of our nation is threatened by deterioration of library collections, and
>
> Whereas, past National Endowment for the Humanities grants have helped to create a cadre of trained preservation specialists and have also increased awareness of the importance of the issue within the library and archival communities, and
>
> Whereas, there are now available a range of technical solutions that make it possible to preserve the information contained in library collections, and
>
> Whereas, the cost of accomplishing this preservation remains a major barrier for librarians;
>
> Therefore, be it resolved, that the Association of Research Libraries supports the initiative taken by the National Endowment for the Humanities to establish an Office of Preservation, and expresses gratitude to the NEH for its continuing support of preservation activities.

This resolution is an appropriate introduction to our next two speakers: Richard Ekman, Director of the NEH Division of Research Programs, and Harold Cannon, Director of the new NEH Office of Preservation. Mr. Ekman, would you begin, please?

Remarks by Richard Ekman

MR. EKMAN: Thank you for that resolution. My colleagues and I are extremely pleased to learn of its passage. Thanks, too, to all of you for letting us come to your meeting as guests. This is my first time at an ARL meeting; some of my colleagues have been to previous meetings.

I want to make four points very quickly. First, I want to assure you that support for libraries continues to be alive and well at the Endowment. Principally through the Access grant category, the Endowment tries to make important research materials available to scholars. It remains a very strong part of the

Endowment's work. The recent reorganization of the Endowment's programs may have obscured the fact that almost every proposal that would have been eligible for support in the Access category previously remains eligible now. That is to say, funds continue to be available for the arrangement and description of manuscript collections, oral histories, record surveys, some microfilm projects, and the preparation of other finding aids.

There has been some confusion about the recent reorganization and about the Endowment's commitment to support of the Access category. The reorganization is part of an effort to expand the Endowment's efforts in preserving documentary materials and making them accessible to scholars. Despite the fact that the proposed FY 1986 budget is somewhat smaller than the FY 1985 budget, the combined request for the Access category and the new Preservation Office is $7.3 million, which represents more than a 50% increase for those activities taken together. Based on a review of past grant applications that include both "access" and "preservation" components, we anticipate little difficulty on the part of applicants in using both categories. In fact, just to play it safe, we have decided to keep the deadline for applications in both those categories the same so we can slide a proposal from one to the other as seems appropriate.

My second point is more general and tentative. I believe you will discover that the reorganization of the Research Division will have the effect of placing more emphasis on the work of research libraries. Let me illustrate the point this way. When the Centers for Advanced Study program was housed in the Fellowships Division, the criteria for judging applications included both the intrinsic importance of the topic under study and the degree to which the proposed fellowship would allow an individual to grow or develop. Now that the Centers for Advanced Study program is housed in the Research Division, the emphasis is much more on the intrinsic importance of the topic itself. Clusters of fellowships will be awarded to centers more, I anticipate, on the basis of the degree to which the coordinated effort of those fellows will use a collection of materials that is intrinsically important.

Third, you should anticipate more reliance at the Endowment on the gifts and matching mechanism for funding projects. Also, you can anticipate that more emphasis will be placed on supporting projects that universities already consider high priorities for themselves—that is, projects that build upon distinctive strengths of faculty and library collections.

Finally, I should reassure you—given my migration from the Education Division to the Research Division of the Endowment—that my move is not a harbinger of greater emphasis on the pedagogical utility of research in the way in which the Research Division operates. It is not. We all recognize that it has become fashionable to juxtapose scholarly research, on the one hand, and the relevance of a subject to undergraduate education, on the other. That is a false dichotomy, just as it is inaccurate to suggest that the principal problem with undergraduate education is that faculty members are spending too much time in specialized research. Many of the recent reports that have appeared on higher education use the alleged research interests of faculty members as the scapegoat, but that is an incorrect presentation of the reality on most campuses.

In conclusion, I want to say again how pleased I am to be here as a newcomer to the world of research libraries. I look forward to talking with many of you in the next few days and also in the months ahead. At this time, let me introduce my colleague Harold Cannon.

Remarks from Harold Cannon

MR. CANNON: There may seem to be quite a lot of us from the Endowment here today. I am delighted with the resolution that has been read. I am excited about the new Office of Preservation. It was 1976 when Ron Berman put me in charge of the Research Division, and instructed me to clean out that stable. It is still in that condition. Richard has described extremely well the way in which the split or separation has occurred. I could put it perhaps in a different way from a personal point of view.

For a long time in the Research Division, I was responsible for 12 funding categories. Two of those categories, the preservation category and U.S. Newspapers category, have been subtracted, so to speak, from the Research Division, and have gone off into a new administrative entity. It is new and yet it is not new, because the Endowment has been funding preservation for a number of years out of Research. But the Office of Preservation itself, located on the eighth floor of the old Post Office Building, is an innovation. We are very much an item in the FY 1986 budget and we are requesting a level of $5 million; if we get such an appropriation in FY 1986, the new office will come into existence fully.

Richard has already told you that we will use the same deadline for both access and preservation proposals and indeed, as people phone up and say, "I am interested in putting in a proposal, please send the guidelines," we will explain that we do not have guidelines. It takes a long time to prepare guidelines, but we will be sending a two-page report indicating that the old Research Resources guidelines, dated October of 1983, may be used for either Access or Preservation for the June 1 deadline this year.

The Office of Preservation will, in addition, have a second deadline during the fiscal year of 1986 of December 1, 1985 and it is in preparation for that that we will have separate Office of Preservation guidelines, which should be available to the public in the late summer or early fall.

I want to mention a couple of things that are in the works because those guidelines are pretty well in shape at this point. They were approved generally, for example, by the National Council for the Humanities last week. The two principal changes you will see when you look at those guidelines are that, first of all, we are interested in three possible strategies for getting at the preservation problem. The preservation problem for us seems to be centered on the printed word, and the word "documentation," which is the generic term which we will use in the guidelines, is intended to include all materials of use to research in the humanities. We are not excluding photographic applications, but we are putting our emphasis on books because that seems to be where the field is most ready to act.

Two of the ways in which the preservation problem can be approached are (1) by cooperative microfilming projects, and we have examples of those already as this organization very well knows, and (2) by what I would like to call a disciplinary approach. We have one example of the latter: the American Philological Association has taken upon itself to look at the works in the field of classics published between 1850 and 1918 and determine which should be preserved. This project could be a model. It may be easier with the classics and more difficult in other areas, but it is a model to follow.

A third approach is one of the novelties of these guidelines: the individual institutional approach. We will be inviting individual institutions to share with us their plans for preservation of their collections, both retrospective and prospective, and to request Endowment funds to support the costs of implementing those plans over the next few years. In the past, we have considered particular collections at individual institutions and have said, "Yes, we will help you with that, but we have not invited institutions to share with us institutional plans for preservation. So this will be a novelty.

We are also going to be a bit more generous in the funding of equipment. For many institutions, there will be start-up costs: the purchasing of equipment and the hiring of hands. We have helped in the past with salaries, but we must now be prepared to support equipment costs, too.

We will also be responsible for the collection and promulgation of statistics. The question of how much can be saved received varied answers: from 1-2% to 3-4%. We must settle that question, but it is obvious that a great many volumes will not be saved, and we want to make sure that the right volumes are saved.

Special Report: COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES

MR. TALBOT: The next segment of our program is a series of reports from the Council on Library Resources, beginning with Jim Haas.

Remarks by Warren J. Haas

MR. HAAS: Thank you, it is good to be here. My principal job today is to introduce Deanna Marcum, Lee Jones, and Ted Johnson.

I want to do two things on my own if I may, before I turn the reporting duty over to my colleagues. One is to talk very briefly about Ted Johnson's subject, the Economics Seminar. I will leave the actual work to him but I just wanted to go on the record on behalf of Martin Cummings, who is not here, to express Marty's gratitude to ARL, both the individual librarians who have contributed information needed in the analysis of library costs and, especially, to the ARL committees that have supported the effort.

For information, and to refresh your memory, about a year ago we undertook a project to consider the costs and funding of libraries and the information services they provide. The objective is not simply to tally up the costs but to find improved ways for librarians and university officers, together, to look ahead more than one year at a time. Dr. Cummings has established a group of 15 or so informed individuals who have now met twice as the core of the seminar—a mix of economists, librarians, and university administrators. The third and final meeting of the group is scheduled for late October. A number of studies have been commissioned, including one by the National Association of College and University Business Officers. Further, in the last three months, seminars have been conducted on five campuses. Two others are scheduled, at North Carolina and MIT. These meetings, typically called by the librarian of the campus to consider economic topics, are designed more to help Marty than to provide assistance to the participants. CLR has a small staff, but we depend on people all over the country for help, and every once in a while we take the opportunity to let each of you know that we are grateful.

I want to spend a little time talking about the expansion of CLR's research program. More than a year ago, CLR's Board began to consider the prospect for improvement that technology is ultimately going to offer to universities, and the effect of that technology on scholarship, teaching, and research. The more we talked, the more we realized we were talking about the character of libraries as active participants in the process of teaching, research, and scholarship.

There is also concern that the most effective changes are not necessarily going to happen by accident. To improve the odds, we are trying to build a new plateau of credible information about the way information is generated, distributed, and used.

More important is the way libraries and universities are organized; in the end, we are really talking about the fundamental structures of universities themselves. There are interesting experiments going on but, most often, it is a trial and error type of approach. The Board agreed that we should try to upgrade substantially the quality, the level, and the scope of research related to this set of problems related to using, generating, and distributing information, with special attention to the library's role. In a nutshell, it is clear that libraries have a fundamental role to play in the future, but the fact is, we do not really know the way.

Returning to Jim Govan's earlier comments, this may not be the time for fundamental change, and I believe he is right. But, when we look back to this point in time, it is likely that libraries will be different in fundamental ways. We are not trying to be prescriptive about the future, but we are trying to promote discussions and thinking. Since December, we have visited six university campuses, many of them represented here, to meet with ten or 15 members of the faculty and administration to talk in general terms about library service and information systems. From those meetings, we became even more convinced that we were moving in the right direction.

We are considering a five-year enterprise to expand research substantially as it relates to the process of using and supplying information in universities.

We are looking at a budget of four to five million dollars, and I am optimistic that by mid-summer, sufficient funding will be in hand so that we can proceed. We have put together the beginning of an advisory group. Among the members are William Schaefer, Executive Vice Chancellor at the University of California, Los Angeles; Lawrence Cremin, a distinguished historian of education; Basil

Stuart-Stubbs, Dean of the School of Library Science at the University of British Columbia; Richard Bulliet, Director of the Middle East Institute at Columbia University; John Coatsworth, professor of history at the University of Chicago; Seymour Pollack, professor of computer science at Washington University; Henry Rieckin, a psychologist and Associate Director of the National Library of Medicine for Planning and Evaluation; William Welsh, Deputy Librarian of Congress; Robert Warner, Dean of the School of Library Science at the University of Michigan; Brian Perry, Director of Research and Development at the British Library; and Herbert Morton, Director of the Office of Scholarly Communication. That is not a complete list, and we will be adding to it. I will also note that Pat Battin has joined the ranks of the Council's regular consultants and will assist with this new program. I will not go into details about how we will proceed except to say that we will work with a number of universities to identify those that have an interest in, and a willingness to participate in, the research program.

In addition, funds are being earmarked to support research by individuals with interests and skills pertinent to key topics.

We anticipate that there will be campus sessions to consider issues and information generated by the research process. I would also assume there will be a substantial new series of publications describing the work. We think of this general effort as a substantial expansion of a long-term research commitment focused not only on a set of immediately pertinent library operating activities but also on topics that are somewhat broader in scope. We hope to involve and use the best people we can get, wherever they are.

We will probably contract for a few basic studies to set the stage but the hope is that we will stimulate research by many individuals over a fairly long period of time. In the end this will be interesting implications for professional education, for the nature of the profession itself, for the place of libraries in research universities.

I will stop there and introduce Deanna Marcum.

Remarks by Deanna Marcum

MS. MARCUM: I would like to tell you about some of the things that have happened at the Council since we last reported, some of the grants we have made, and some of the programs that are underway. I will talk most about the professional educational programs because that is the area in which we have had the most grants activity.

I call to your attention two brochures that have just been completed. One is a brochure describing the grant program of the Council; you should have received these in your libraries by now. We have brought a few extra in case you have not and ask that you make sure your staff see them to encourage as much creative thinking on the part of librarians as possible.

The second brochure, which you should receive in the next few days, describes the management intern program. The intern program will be offered again in 1986-87. Applications are due October 16, 1985. There are a couple of changes.

One is the number of interns is limited to three this year and the stipend has been increased to $30,000. We hope you will encourage good candidates to apply for the program. Let us know if you need more of these brochures.

There are other deadlines I should mention. The next Faculty/Librarian Cooperative Research Program proposal deadline is September 1. We just completed the May 1 cycle, receiving 20 proposals. We had so many responses last year that we increased the number of cycles to three. The proposals, both the number and quality, have been gratifying. The program appears to be an excellent vehicle to involve librarians inexperienced in research techniques with faculty who have somewhat more experience in this area.

The other program deadline I call to your attention is the Internship for Recent Graduates. CLR issued guidelines earlier this year, encouraging libraries to design internship programs for those new librarians already on the staff. We did that largely because library deans report that the best students are being recruited to special libraries because the jobs are more interesting. This is our attempt to encourage libraries to think about their obligations for continuing education of new graduates. The next deadline for this program is July 1, 1985.

Two grants have been made for programs that look very promising indeed. One grant, to the University of Georgia, will involve eight to 12 new librarians each year in a program that includes course work, research trips to other libraries, and analysis of broad problems. The other is to a multi-institutional group in Chicago: the University of Chicago, the University of Chicago Graduate Library School, Northwestern University, and the University of Illinois at Chicago. This is no doubt a difficult undertaking but they plan to involve the new librarians from each of the institutions in a seminar for a year. They will go to each of the campuses, look at different situations, and conduct research.

A grant made to the University of Michigan is a cooperative effort of the University of Michigan Library School and the library to recruit distinctive liberal arts college graduates into the profession. Part of the program will be an intership in the university library. We made a grant to ARL for the Second Institute for Library Educators that will be held in 1986. An implementation grant was made to the University of Wisconsin—Madison to develop a program of supplementary education in quantitative and analytical research skills. The academic sessions will be held beginning this summer at the Madison campus and you will be asked to nominate staff.

I know you are all busy. I can tell from the other reports today that you have a lot to do but we are anxious to increase the research activities and we hope you will call on us with ideas for proposals.

I believe Lee is now going to talk about the Bibliographic Services Development Program (BSDP).

Remarks by C. Lee Jones

MR. JONES: There is a written report and I will try not to duplicate it. I want to call your attention to several items in it.

The first is a program that I have talked to you about before, a contract with the Association of American Publishers to develop codes for manuscripts in electronic form. Those codes have now been specified. They have been proposed in guideline form and there are 50 authors now trying to use them as they produce articles for journals, books, and textbooks. We intend to evaluate their experiences during late summer. They are on a relatively fast track. None of these authors are yet producing mathematical or symbolic material; most is pretty much textual with some modest graphs incorporated. The incorporation of these codes into software, word processing software is a project that the AAP is actively exploring. It is not included in the present contract, so they will find other resources to accomplish this particular task. The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) is prepared to accept the recommendations of the AAP for this set of codes as a proposed standard after the test has been complete.

A few words are in order on projects that have flowed from the meeting held last year at the Spring Hill Conference Center in Minnesota. The principal topic of those meetings—that is, retrospective conversion—can be traced to the decision on the part of the Council back in 1978 to name Jim Govan to the Program Committee of the BSDP. Jim, shortly after accepting this appointment, began to ask us why in the world we were not paying some attention to the needs of retrospective conversion. It took a while, but now you have seen the results of Jim's persistence. Jutta Reed-Scott reminded us this morning that the music group has in fact gone ahead of ARL, and proceeded on their own to prepare a plan for retrospective conversion of music materials. In fact, that project has been funded by Title II-C.

I want to spend some time talking about the Linked Systems Project. We have talked about this project for many years, but we finally have records going over the wire. The Library of Congress is now routinely pumping authority records into the RLIN System. The RLIN System is on the verge of being able to capture and integrate them. Soon, RLIN will be sending authority records back to LC. WLN has another set of problems. They have a system configuration that denies them the luxury of testing one part of this system at a time and must in fact test the entire system. Consequently, in August, they will be ready to receive records and transmit records.

Earlier this year, the Council provided a grant to support OCLC to become a full participating member of the Linked Systems Project. Capitalizing on the work of the other partners, they are well along the line and expect to be able to test their full system later this year, probably at the same time that all other participants go into their full and final test modes. We anticipate that early in the next calendar year, we will have an operating system.

It is time to begin to look at the management issues that the LSP will present. A management group will be named to begin dealing with such issues as: How are we going to pay for services? What are the actual system parameters that will be used during the linkage process? The telecommunication protocols are operational at LC and RLIN, not yet at WLN or OCLC, but they are getting close since the protocols are coded and ready for testing. CLR is putting together a technical advisory group on the LSP protocols. That group will spend a couple years making certain that any changes made in the protocols are made across all participating systems. Ultimately, it is likely that the Library of Congress will manage the protocols on behalf of NISO. The National Information Standards Organization is already working on some of the protocol issues and will deal with all of them as they become available.

Approximately 18 months ago, the Oklahoma Department of Libraries specified that the Linked Systems Project protocols must be implemented by vendor systems being purchased with any state dollars in Oklahoma. The vendors turned to the Oklahoma Department of Libraries and said, "Fine, we will not do business in Oklahoma." Oklahoma then alerted all state libraries and 30 of them have agreed to specify LSP protocols in local systems, and the vendors have gotten the word. They have been invited to two LSP discussion meetings and have shown up in droves. There is another meeting scheduled by the NISO for ALA in July, again, to provide the vendor community with the latest information on the Linked Systems protocols.

So far, the LSP protocols have dealt only with authority information. You may recall that the Council had an effort to define what other bibliographic applications might flow over the link. We anticipate that this effort will be started again by midsummer. That effort is, in fact, to define what other applications will flow over this link.

In the area of subject access to information, I want to report on the OCLC/Forest Press project that is attempting to use the Dewey Decimal classification to enhance subject access services in online catalogs. They have developed a prototype catalog that is portable and they have developed two versions of an online catalog; one with the Dewey Decimal classification and one without. The prototype was installed first at Illinois and data was collected from real live users. It has been installed at the Columbus, Franklin County Public Library. I believe at the moment it is still at the Library of Congress where information is being collected not only from users but also those who are preparing the Dewey Decimal classification schedules. The New York State Library is the final stop of the prototype and again data use will be collected. We anticipate final reports will be available early in November. I should remind you that while we are using the Dewey Decimal classification system in this project, it is viewed as a model. It is just as easy--I will take that "easy" back; it is just as possible to use the LC classification scheme to enhance subject access.

Finally, I would report to you that just recently we wound up another one of our CLR conferences focused on the online catalog. That particular conference focused on online screen displays. We had 23 online catalog systems that managed to demonstrate their success during the meeting and, in fact, established the background against which discussions proceeded. It is unlikely that any of those 23 systems will remain as they were when they came to that conference. We had some folks suggest that they thought they had the very best screen displays and they left saying that we helped to improve them further. There will be much changing and I believe users of the online catalogs will be better off for it.

Remarks by Herbert F Johnson

MR. JOHNSON (Emory University): I want to share with you a few comments from the viewpoint of the research library and some of us who have participated in either the general Economics Seminar or in the mini-seminars held around the country.

The intent of the program in the general seminars has been to invite a core group of university officers and library directors, plus other invited participants from bibliographic utilities, the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), and economists. The first seminar held in March, 1984, identified a number of the major economic problems and attempted to define some of the data needed to address economic issues. Studies were commissioned on the basis of that seminar. The second seminar, which was last November, included presentations on some of the economic studies followed by discussion of issues raised.

That second seminar had two themes running simultaneously, and sometimes in a disconcerting juxtaposition. One theme, at the macro level, addressed what is the research library, and what is it becoming? The other, on the micro level, was a more specific discussion of measurement and methodologies to identify costs, including discussions about how one might try to measure benefits of libraries. The focus on benefits brought out ideas and elements needed to provide a baseline of economics data in research libraries today, which could also allow us to monitor performance in the future to identify and measure changes in library operations as they occur.

The third seminar, scheduled for this fall, is to be devoted to the management and organizational arrangements in research libraries. During this year there have been mini-seminars at several research library sites around the country: Florida State University, Emory University, the University of Illinois, the University of Texas, the University of California at Los Angeles, and yet to come the University of North Carolina and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

I would like to share some of the impressions and arrangements that we made in Georgia. The participants in the seminar held at Emory University included delegations from the Georgia Institute of Technology and the University of Georgia as well. We brought together a senior vice president from each of our three institutions, the computer director, a senior faculty member, and a couple of other individuals. From the faculties we each invited a humanist, a social scientist, and a scientist which made for interesting discussions.

It had been planned to distribute a couple of papers in advance to the participants, one having to do with an in-depth discussion of cost studies, and the other, a summary of the Economics Seminars themselves. These were fairly substantial documents, and after looking at them, we decided they would not be of interest to or read by the Vice Presidents. Vice Presidents prefer single-page memos! So, we asked Dr. Cummings if we might adjust the plan.

We (the library directors) sat down and listed for ourselves a series of questions that we thought might stimulate their thinking and help shape the discussions as we proceeded through the session. The questions that we eventually settled upon are the following: "Where and how do scholars obtain needed information today and how do you see that changing?" "What issues and choices are we facing in resource allocation to pursue the desired trends and priorities?" (You may say these are vague, but that was intentional to stimulate discussion. You could make up your own better questions.) The third question was, "Why is library excellence of prime importance to the university mission?" Four, "What is the role of the library on the campus and what opportunities do you see?" And five, "How do we pay for the introduction for information services derived from new technologically-based systems?"

We asked Paul Kantor and David Bishop to prepare a few thoughts about these questions, Paul taking the role of the scholar on how he goes about using information today and what he would like to see, while David talked from the perspective of the research library director. The first part of the session was devoted to talking about the theme of the library on campus, including the relationship with the computer center, and the discussion raged hot and heavy around the room. After a break, David kicked us off with remarks about some of the economic issues, so that the focus of the latter part of the seminar was around those themes. Dr. Cummings assures me that it was very helpful to his needs, being able to share with us, hear the concerns and the interests expressed, and learn of the various situations that were described from the three campuses helped stimulate the awareness of the problems and issues which vary on different campuses. It set the stage, I believe, and the burden is now on us to take this background and the new awareness, to carry it forward on our campuses.

It was a very stimulating kind of conference and meeting, and we were very grateful to the Council for its support and help.

I should also mention in my role as Chair of the Statistics Committee that we were very pleased with the cooperation that has developed with the Council in the area of economic studies and help with the development of our supplemental questionnaire. We appreciate your participation as well. The Council has been very helpful to us in the program and very supportive of our attempts to get a better handle on how much information service is delivered by our libraries and getting a sense of what this is costing us. So I believe that coordinated efforts of research libraries themselves, the Association, and the Council is a very gratifying development. I hope it will continue.

Report from the Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials

MR. TALBOT: David Weber will present a report from the ARL Committee on the Preservation of Research Library Materials.

MR. WEBER (Stanford University): First of all, the Preservation Committee very much appreciates the ARL Board's action commending the National Endowment for the Humanities on creation of its new Office of Preservation, an opportunity for each of us over the next year or two, and, I hope, for a long time to come.

My purpose today is to bring membership up-to-date on the Guidelines for Minimum Preservation Efforts in ARL Libraries. These were task 84-4 in the ARL Plan of Action under Objective Three, which addresses preservation. The

Association adopted those guidelines, as you know, last October.

Section 2 of the Guidelines dealt with statistics, and statistics are also task 85.4 of the Plan of Action. The need for data collection was underscored by the very extensive ARL Preservation Microfilm Study, the report of which will be issued this fall. Let me speak of some of the summary conclusions from that study concerning improved record-keeping practices.

The need for improved record-keeping practices is not wholly self-evident. Libraries can, of course, carry on the preservation activities without such records. On both the local and North American levels, however, the absence of universally kept, consistent records is a serious problem. Records are needed for assessing needs and measuring progress toward meeting them, for establishing costs and comparing the cost-effectiveness of programs, for providing guidance on accepted minimum levels of effort, and for establishing measures to evaluate performance in serving scholars and other library users. Finally, from that prerequisite, improved record-keeping includes the assembling of a consistent terminology and definitions for preservation procedures and programs, selection of data elements to record, and development of policies for collecting and disseminating statistical summaries. The Preservation Committee is working on each of these points, and this week has made considerable progress at refining the definitions. The ARL Office plans to issue those guidelines for statistical compilation before the end of June, in order that each of us may, in our own institutions, use them as an in-house pilot statistical program for 1985-86.

There are several purposes for this. First, we want to have all members assess from their experience what the definitional problems may be. Second, we want to know what selection difficulties there are. Third, we would like information on the value of the categories: should they be dropped or retained? Finally, next fall the Statistics Committee will be considering whether there is a need to revise those definitions and/or delete some of those statistics. Then, in turn, the Preservation Committee, working with the ARL Statistics Committee, can determine the need for revised statistical guidelines in the future. Furthermore, we want to determine whether ARL should analyze and publish those statistical guidelines, perhaps as part of the supplementary statistical compilation. This will be coming to you sometime in the next five or six weeks, and I hope all of you will try to use the guidelines because our committee will benefit greatly from your experience over the next year.

Consideration of New Members

MR. TALBOT: The Committee on ARL Statistics has reviewed the information provided by Laval University for the past four years, and has reported to the Board that Laval meets the criteria approved by the membership in 1980. Therefore, the Board recommends that the membership invite Laval University to become a member of the Association. As the motion is from the Board, we need no second. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. PETERSON (Southern Illinois University): Just a question. Does this mean that the membership freeze is over?

MR. TALBOT: Yes, unless you wish to vote differently.

MR. PETERSON: Will the Board, at some point, report on the other institutions that may have qualified for membership?

MR. TALBOT: Yes. We have only one other pending request at this time.

Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye. Opposed? The motion is carried. Laval will be invited to become a member.

Although the Board clearly felt that this motion ought to be presented to the membership, the Board did wish me to express to you that we still have some concerns about ARL criteria, particularly the criteria we use to express the "researchness" of a library, i.e. the number of Ph.D fields. We do not believe this works very well, and we continue to hope that we can find another way of measuring this.

ARL President's Report

MR. TALBOT: I would like to bring another motion before you. This is a straw motion that I call the Studer Amendment. Bill Studer, noting the difference between the dollar and the pound, thought it would be a good idea if we held the fall ARL meeting in England. The Board asked the staff to investigate this matter, and they determined that we could not get out of our hotel commitments in Washington for next October. However, in the process of investigating it, Shirley had some discussions with Anthony Loveday, who is her opposite number at the Standing Conference of National and University Libraries (SCONUL), the British analog of ARL, and the suggestion is that perhaps there might be a joint meeting between ARL and SCONUL in 1987, close to the time of the IFLA meeting in England. While this seems to be an attractive idea, the Board would like an expression of opinion, and perhaps a straw vote on this issue from the membership.

MR. ATKINSON (University of Illinois): Having refrained from speaking on the other topics, I will on a minor one. This is, to me, a symbolic one. Some institutions do not have enough travel funds to send the faculty and staff to the appropriate professional organizations. No matter what the actual costs are, the difference of going to Great Britain and/or to dull old Washington, it seems to send absolutely the wrong symbol to all of our staffs, makes a bad statement, and looks just like all the junkets to Barbados we object to so vociferously at stockholders meetings, elective hearings, and the like. I urge you to be sensitive to such symbolism and vote no.

MR. EDELMAN (Rutgers University): I would like to strongly urge we move forward. We tried this unsuccessfully three years ago and, just as now, our colleague from Illinois at that time voiced objections and won out. I am very glad that we have gained support. The significance of international contact for all of us is tremendous. We have not done it right, we have not done it well. I would consider visits to Scottsdale and other places where you elected to go far more of a junket than Oxford or Cambridge or London for that matter. While economic reasons can be given, there are good packages available for traveling to England, so the economics should not be a case. The tremendous benefit for this Association to become truly international would be enormous, so I urge that we go ahead.

MR. TALBOT: Further comments?

MR. CHAPIN (Michigan State University): One thing I believe should be considered is that there are a number of institutions that do not permit foreign travel on state funds. What you are doing, in effect, if you approve this motion, is saying that there are certain institutions that cannot or will not be represented at that meeting. I believe that as long as this is a possibility that exists, you are really disenfranchising a certain group of institutions.

MR. TALBOT: We are only proposing a straw vote at this time and further investigation of this will have to occur. But we wish to test the proposition of whether you are, in fact, right, that there are substantial numbers of members in that position. Further discussion?

MR. LEINBACH (Tulane University): I would like to make another point in support of this, I cannot see why once in ten years or so directors—I do not believe we are poorly paid—cannot kick in a little bit of money to go to England if their state cannot take them. Maybe we need to make a loan.

A second comment. What Hank was talking about in our moving in the international sphere—our two major bibliographic utilities are going international, and it behooves us to be doing the same thing. We ought to have more contact with our foreign colleagues and I cannot think of a better place to start than Great Britain. On the topic of the international, not on the symbols, I would suggest two things: if in fact we are being rational, would we want to transport 117 people to meet with 25 when we should be bringing 25 to meet 117?

MS. ECHELMAN: Actually SCONUL has 71 members, not 25.

MR. TALBOT: Do you want to take a straw vote on this? All in favor of this, please raise your hand. We need not count the house, as I believe we have a majority. We still need to take a survey of the membership by mail to get explicit opinion about this.

While I am here I would like to make two other comments about the general procedures of the organization. I would like to hark back to two issues raised at Colorado Springs last May that stand out prominently in my mind. One of them is relevance, the need to continually look at ARL as an organization, trying to make it more effective so it can realize what we wanted it to be. The chief vehicle for this is the ARL Plan, or at least that is how the Board views it. This is the first year of the review of the plan, and we are trying to crank up our procedures to make this a more intelligible process. We intend to produce a report that we will issue to you during the summer, and we hope this will give you a more coherent view of the various activities of ARL.

The second theme that stands out in my mind from our discussions in Colorado is the need to involve and engage the membership more extensively in the activities of the Association. This is something that we are eager to hear your opinions about. In particular, I know that many of the directors who are newer to the organization feel that they do not have the participation that they would like to have, and we would like to hear from them as well—and we would like to ask all of you to try to be welcoming to them. You may not think this occurs, but if you talk to them you find that they do feel outsiders in this organization still, so I would ask you to make a greater effort to involve the newer directors in the organization.

Of particular concern to new directors, and some of the older directors as well, is the mysterious process by which we appoint members to committees. We are trying to make a more deliberate effort to rotate membership on committees. We will be sending out, if the Board approves, a notice to all of you to ask you to express your opinion on what committees you would like to serve on, and we would also appreciate any other advice you have for us on these matters.

Having said that, I will now turn to the rest of our business today.

Report of the ARL Executive Director

MS. ECHELMAN: I just would like to start by telling all of you that when I came to work at ARL I truly thought retrospective conversion referred to religious rights of a certain sect in this country. I have learned a great deal about it in the last four years.

You have all received an activities and status report on the last six months of ARL activities. [See Appendix A.] There are just two issues that I would like to discuss with you this morning, they both relate to activities in Washington having to do with our governmental relations.

The first issue I would like to talk to you about this morning is the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Legislative hearings are about to begin for this act. It is possible that there will be reauthorization in 1985; it is more likely that the actual reauthorization will occur in 1986. In preparation for new legislation, however, the Association has worked very closely with the American Library Association and with the Association of American Universities, and has also cooperated with the American Council on Education.

Earlier this year, ARL was requested by the chairman of the Post-secondary Education Committee of the House of Representatives, Congressman William Ford of Michigan, to make suggestions for effective language for reauthorization. For Title II specifically we chose to work together with the American Library Association, through the ALA Washington Office and the Legislative Committee of ACRL, and we have produced a joint recommendation for Title II and Title VI-A. If anyone wants a copy of our legislative language recommendations, you can get it by calling the ARL Office.

There are two parts I would like to point out. Specifically we are recommending no substantive changes in Title II-C, merely a more realistic level of authorization. We are also recommending a new part D. Those of you who have been around as long as John McDonald and I have known that II-D refers to the National Periodical Center—a section of Title II we consider to be defunct in terms of capability for funding in the future. So we are recommending a new part called the College Library Technology and Coordinating Grant. Part D as we are recommending it is intended to encourage the development of elementary uses of technological equipment in libraries so that services of academic libraries of all sizes could benefit from research and demonstration projects and the application of the results of such projects made possible under this program. The goal is a nationwide network of information resources in support of scholarship, and we know this goal is strengthened when each additional library is able to join and participate.

Title II, Part D has two basic philosophies. There are four sections. The first two sections refer to libraries being able to join in technological projects, come up on networks and so forth by demonstrating need for and the inability to fund such participation locally. The last two parts are intended to allow bibliographic networks to service consortiums and large institutions to do research and demonstration projects which then can be extended to the field in general. This section has been discussed with the chairman and the ranking minority members of the committee. It actually arises from a suggestion that Congressman Ford made in a bill that he introduced last year, H.R. 5210.

I would also like to call your attention to Title VI of the Higher Education Act, a title that we have not paid a great deal of attention to in the past, which is called International Education Programs. We are recommending a new Part A for Title VI. The general purpose of the recommendation is to provide grants that would improve the availability of periodical publications published outside the United States that are of scholarly or research importance. There has been some money in some grants under Title VI to provide research materials as part of the grant but we are making it more explicit as a separate part of the proposal. This proposal arose from a suggestion made by then Congressman, now Senator Paul Simon of Illinois, who has had a great interest in foreign language study in the United States.

I am very hopeful that the Higher Education Act will be reauthorized with all of this language in it. Whether or not we will get funding is quite another question.

The other item I would like to bring to your attention this morning is a circular from the Office of Management and Budget which was part of the Federal Register for Friday, March 15, and refers to the management of Federal information resources. It is, in my personal opinion, one of the most dangerous documents I have seen come out of the United States Government in many, many years. ARL has prepared a lengthly response to this circular. We will make this response available to all of you through the mail soon. The response centers around the following statements. We acknowledge the responsibility given to OMB by the Paperwork Reduction Act to minimize the cost to the Federal Government of collecting, maintaining, using, and disseminating information. We conclude, however, that OMB has focused too much on the cost to the Federal Government without regard to the obligation of the Government to make public information reasonably available to taxpayers, and without consideration of the qualitative benefits of government information to the effective functioning of government and society, by focusing exclusively on the budgetary aspects of information dissemination.

Another purpose of the Paperwork Reduction Act is to maximize the usefulness of information collected by the Federal Government. I hope you will all take the time to read this circular. It is very complex but if it is instituted in its present form it will make great changes in the kinds of and amounts of information that we have available in this country.

That is the end of my report. If anyone has any questions, I would be glad to answer them.

MR. TALBOT: Thank you. Duane will give us a report on OMS.

Report on the Office of Management Studies

MR. WEBSTER: We have produced a narrative report to give a bit more detail on the status of various office activities [see Appendix C]. I will not repeat what is in that report, but I would like to highlight some recent developments in several projects of interest to you. [Excerpts from the OMS 1984 Annual Report appear in Appendix D.]

First, the ARL Committee on Management of Research Library Resources asked the staff to put together a statement of program and financial strategy over the short term and long term. We prepared that paper and any of members who would be interested in looking at what we are thinking about over the longer term in terms of the program directions and the financial directions that the office is taking, I would be happy to share that with you.

The first project I want to update you on is the grant that Deanna Marcum mentioned yesterday. The Council on Library Resources has awarded the Association a second grant, for $46,000, to conduct a second Institute on Research Libraries for library school faculty. The purpose of this grant, as in the first situation, is to identify and work with a select group of library educators, and we hope, in the process, alert them to the current needs, interests, and directions that research libraries are taking. The first Institute, held at the University of North Carolina, with Jim Govan and Ed Holly's help, was a successful event. From the participants point of view, it was worthwhile and they would be able to use the experience to in fact shape and redirect their curriculums as well as the way they are approaching the preparation of future research librarians.

The second late-breaking development concerns the North American Research Collections Inventory project. As you may recall, Robert Miller reported at the last meeting on a proposal for Phase 3 of that project that would be concerned with providing the suppport for broad participation by all ARL members in the process of completing consistent, comparable collection descriptions that can be used not only for internal collection management purposes but for some of the planning necessary on the larger questions of cooperative collection development within the country. That proposal, which has a price tag of roughly $236,000 for the three-year period, was presented to the Andrew Mellon Foundation this spring and on the basis of some questions and recollections by the Foundation it was revised and resubmitted. We understand it will be presented to the Board of that Foundation the first part of June, and we are optimistic about the prospects for that grant.

The third project is the National Endowment for Humanities grant to support Preservation Planning Program studies in ten member libraries. That grant, for $65,000, is well under way. Four libraries have started the studies. In fact, two of the four are very close to completion. The remaining six libraries will be beginning their programs before the end of the year.

In addition to those separately-funded projects, there are several initiatives that might interest you. First, the automation inventory of ARL members. As you recall, the purpose of that activity is to collect concrete information on the impact of technology on member libraries, as member libraries are rapidly changing. In this area, the essence of the advice of the ARL Committee on Management was that we needed better, more current information both of a descriptive nature on what libraries are doing in specific areas, but also they have encouraged us to collect expenditure information on those automation activities. Though the initial test in 1984 was well received—we had 111 institutions contributing data—there were concerns about the precision of definitions of the terms, the accuracy of the responses, and the timeliness of the information in the database, as well as the readability of the trial publication that we shared with you in December. As a result of those reactions from members, we have revised the data collecting instrument. It was distributed to you in March. The information that we are getting back seems to be of a better quality and we are taking the step this time of having each institution review its profile of contributed data before the revised version of the inventory is compiled.

We are also finding that we are, in fact, able to collect expenditure information in this automation area. The Council on Library Resources has provided a small grant out of their Economics Seminar project to support this part of the activity. It appears that we will be able to come up with some sense of overall aggregate expenditures in this area. To date we have 90 responses, of which 50 include detailed financial expenditures. We hope to be able to complete the data-gathering by June, so I urge you, if you have not completed the information, to submit it to us within the next month.

Another new project is the Analytical Skills Institute. As you know, this was an effort we announced last year. The purpose of it is to provide specific training in the problem-solving activities in which staff typically are involved. The emphasis is toward using analytical quantitative techniques to define more clearly and understand the problems, with the aim of developing better solutions. Two institutes have been scheduled. The first institute at the University of Pittsburgh in June is fully booked. The second institute, scheduled for San Diego in December, is 50% booked, and we are expecting that one to be fully subscribed shortly. We have had several requests about the possibility of individual institutions sponsoring Analytical Skills Institutes in the future. Though we are interested in this, we would like to have the experience of these two public institutes under our belt before we schedule additional events. Our expectation is that these initial events will be refined and improved on the basis of experience.

And, finally, the Management Institutes for ARL Directors. As you know, we have held two of those institutes. The one this past February was as well attended as the previous institute in 1984. This year the institute covered the topics of the role of the director in the university, strategic planning, and organizational change. We proposed to the Management Committee that we hold a third institute on a different set of topics, but the committee prefers that we hold the same institute a third time. So, we will offer a third Management Institute for ARL Directors in February 1986, covering those same three topics. At the same time, however, the committee urged us to explore putting together a one or two-day workshop for directors on a specific topic to complement the three-and-a-half-day event. We will keep you posted as things develop in this area.

And finally, in terms of the Management Committee, Jay Lucker has been the chairman of that group over the last several years and been very extraordinarily influential and helpful to the staff. I wanted to thank him for his work. He continues to serve on the committee but there is a new chair and I would like to acquaint you with her. She is Joan Chambers.

As always, the staff welcomes any ideas, any comments, or suggestions on OMS activities.

Report from the Committee on ARL Statistics

MR. TALBOT: Thank you. Ted Johnson, the chairman of the Committee on ARL Statistics, will give you a report on our supplemental statistics.

MR. JOHNSON: We mailed to you, from the ARL Office with a cover letter from me, a report entitled ARL Supplementary Statistics for 1983-84. Some of you may have received it before you left for this meeting, but I suspect most of you did not. We had hoped to get the report out a little earlier so we might have a bit of discussion of it here, but failing that, I want to call it to your attention and to remind you that this is the result of the work we began last year to explore the addition of some new data elements in our statistics. We are also trying to work with some of the suggestions and ideas beginning to develop through the Council's Economic Seminar to contribute additional information to our statistics in order to make them more complete and to reflect more accurately the current environment of our libraries across the country. I call your attention to the introduction in the report and the analysis.

You will recall when we talked about issuing this new set of information, we indicated to you that we would not plan to distribute or publish this information for the first year or two until we have had a chance to look it over, reflect on it, comment on it, and be comfortable with it. That is our plan. The document has an introductory set of paragraphs and sections that attempt to analyze the institutional data that is presented in the report, and our thought is, bearing in mind our promise to you, that we might share the summary analytical information with inquiring folks. But for the time being we would not plan to distribute very widely the whole report with the tables of individual library data.

We would appreciate information from you and feedback about the report, data that you find helpful and of interest, data that you think would be useful to continue to collect, and particularly to move into the regular annual statistics. The committee is meeting again on June 3 to do its final work of preparation of the data collection questionnaire instruments for the 1984-85, and we plan to send you additional updated, refined, supplementary questionnaires taking into account some of the comments and suggestions you already made when you submitted the information to us before. We would like to include any ideas or suggestions you might have.

If you would take the time when you get home to look at this explicitly, talk with the person or persons on your staff that collect the information and share with us anything that you have that would be helpful for us as we plan for next year, I would appreciate it. We are interested in not only knowing what kinds of information you would like collected that would help you reflect more accurately your operations but also comments or ideas on data that are no longer of interest, that perhaps we have been collecting and not reviewed for many years—there has been little change of the data elements since the 1950s. I am also interested in the kinds of information that you find you have to collect in your own institution and would like to know about having from other institutions that we do not collect as an association. One of the easiest ways to do that would be for you to share with us some of the things you do not collect or find of interest. The sooner we can get that, the better. If you want to mail data like that to me or give me a call or send me material or information through the ARL Office, attention to the Statistics Committee. Again, our meeting will be June 3 in Washington.

MR. TALBOT: Thank you, Ted. Is there any other business to come before us? Will someone make a motion to adjourn then? Second? All in favor?

Thank you very much. Meeting is adjourned.

APPENDIX A

ACTIVITIES AND STATUS REPORT

Association of Research Libraries
November 1984 - April 1985

In the six months since our last report to the membership, the ARL staff has continued to work closely with the Board of Directors, with committees and individual directors, and with non-ARL colleagues and organizations to implement the objectives of ARL's Plan of Action and to advance the cause of research libraries. ARL's work progresses simultaneously across a broad front of programmatic, operational, and coordinating activities. One of the challenges in an organization that is actively pursuing its goals along several routes is to map the progress in such a way as to insure that those in charge of the effort will be able to keep informed about the direction without losing sight of the destination. The Executive Committee and staff have developed several tools to assist the Board in assessing progress on Plan-related tasks and objectives.

Work also continues to improve the Association's fiscal and operational capabilities. ARL's auditors report that the Association's financial position is excellent. The operating reserve has been increased, new fiscal control procedures have been tested and implemented, and other operational procedures continue to be reviewed and improvements implemented as necessary. As a result of these efforts, the Association is in a better position to utilize its own resources more effectively.

Not all of these resources are financial. Indeed, among the most valuable of ARL's resources is the commitment of directors and senior staff members in ARL libraries to the goals and programs of the Association. Those who serve on ARL's committees and those who participate in the work of the Legislative Network and in other Association programs and projects are the backbone of ARL's success. This participation continues to broaden each year, as does the gratitude felt by all of us on staff who depend upon this continued commitment.

Projects and Programs

CONSER A&I Coverage Project

This project, which commenced in November of 1983, will be concluded in December of this year, although most of the project staff will be finished with their work by the end of June. From July to December one staff member will remain to handle maintenance reports and other matters requiring work with foreign ISDS centers. Project staff are establishing the mechanisms and negotiating with A&I services on procedures for reporting changes in their title lists to the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada, which have agreed to undertake responsibility for maintenance of the project's product. The ARL Office has agreed to maintain a file of requests for the addition of new A&I services. At an appropriate time in the future, this file will be reviewed with members of the Project Advisory Committee to see if a second project ought to be developed.

Eighty-six abstracting and indexing services, including 136 different indexes and abstracts are participating in the project. The project has added more than 120,000 index notes to nearly 60,000 unique records.

A number of organizations have contributed to the success of the CONSER A&I Project. The National Endowment for the Humanities, the Council on Library Resources, the H.W. Wilson Foundation, and the Xerox Corporation, all provided funds for the project. Other participants include LC and NLC; Chemical Abstracts Services, which funded the work on the titles in its own lists; and OCLC, which searched and added index notes for nearly 105,000 titles at a reduced rate of payment. The National Federation of Abstracting and Information Services (NFAIS) shared sponsorship with ARL.

The CONSER A&I Coverage project was directed by Carol Mandel and managed by Julia Blixrud. They have been aided in this commendable accomplishment by an Advisory Committee whose members are: Linda Bartley, Library of Congress; Brett Butler, Information Access Corporation; Thomas Delsey, National Library of Canada; Mary Ellen Jacob, OCLC; Jay Lucker, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and James Wood, Chemical Abstracts Services.

North American Collections Inventory Project (NCIP)

Phase II of NCIP—the testing of manuals, training materials, and other resources in the three ARL libraries in Indiana—was completed in December of 1984. Phase II, which was funded by the Lilly Endowment, included: completion of major portions of the Conspectus, and plans for full completion; development of training resources to prepare selection officers to carry out the required collection assessments; development of a survey instrument to identify specialized collections in non-ARL libraries in Indiana; exploration by participating libraries of possible avenues of collection development cooperation; revision of the NCIP Manual prior to making it generally available; training of three consultants to be available as trainers for other libraries embarking on the project; and further development of cooperation with RLG in managing the Inventory. A copy of the final report to the Endowment was mailed to the ARL membership in early April.

A proposal to fund further development and extension of the NCIP to other libraries in the ARL community has been submitted to the Mellon Foundation for consideration.

The University of California libraries have begun to work on completion of conspectus information for their collections; a group of 13 ARL libraries in the Southeastern U.S. has begun to experiment with the conspectus; and the members of the Canadian Association of Research Libraries have agreed in principle to participate in NCIP and are currently working with Jeff Gardner to design needed Canadian adaptations that will remain consistent with NCIP standards.

The North American Collections Inventory Project is managed by Jeff Gardner, Associate Director of OMS, with the assistance of Jutta Reed-Scott. These staff members are working closely with Leslie Hume, of the RLG staff, and with the Project Advisory Committee.

ARL Microform Project

A final report on the preservation component of this project has been prepared for the funding agencies and is available on request from the ARL Office. Information from the survey of research libraries' and historical societies' preservation activities and recommendations arising from analysis of survey results continues to inform the work of the ARL Preservation Committee, as well as that of a number of external committees and groups with ongoing interests in preservation.

The bibliographic component of the Microform Project continues to operate on funding from the Mellon Foundation as a clearinghouse of information on the status of cataloging of microform sets, and the level of interest and inquiry remains high.

Retrospective Conversion Planning Study

A study of the feasibility of a coordinated effort in the area of retrospective conversion of catalog records for monographs in North American research libraries has been completed and a plan prepared for discussion by the ARL membership at the May 1985 meeting. The study was done for ARL by Jutta Reed-Scott, with financial support from the Council on Library Resources. The Committee on Bibliographic Control is the advisory body for this effort.

Legislative and Federal Matters

Objective 4 of the ARL Plan of Action calls for influencing information policies which affect research libraries and their clientele. This objective is pursued by individual directors of member libraries and ARL staff. The ARL Legislative Network was updated in early 1985 to provide the Office with current information about member contacts in Congress. As indicated below, the Network has already been put to use to alert members when contact with Congressional offices is timely.

Telecommunications

Twenty-one ARL directors, ARL staff, and other members of the Telecommunications Coalition contacted members of Congress and Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission about a private line rate increase proposed by AT&T in January 1985. OCLC calculated that the tariff, as initially proposed by AT&T, would result in an increase in telecommunication costs for its members from zero to 80%. AT&T had proposed that this tariff take effect March 4. The letters, telephone calls and personal visits by ARL members and staff contributed to securing significant Congressional support on behalf of libraries. A letter, signed by 28 Senators, went to the Chairman of the FCC, asking for an extended comment period for libraries so that there would be time for adequate analysis of the affect of the new tariff, consideration of a phased implementation for any rate increase for libraries, and consideration of a special tariff for libraries. The FCC written response was negative. However, AT&T subsequently filed revisions to their January proposal that resulted in somewhat lower increases for libraries (AT&T estimates that under this revised proposal, the average rate increase for libraries that are members of OCLC or RLG will be 16.6%) and implementation has been postponed by FCC until April 27, 1985.

Government Information

In December 1984, President Reagan appointed Ralph E. Kennickell as Public Printer and head of the Government Printing Office. ARL staff met with Mr. Kennickell and received assurance of his support for marketing the Depository Library Program and for automating GPO operations to enable the agency to provide better service to its customers. However, Mr. Kennickell expressed reservations about the need to proceed with a previously announced GPO project to update and correct the machine readable tapes of GPO Monthly Catalog records. On learning of his reluctance, 23 ARL member libraries wrote to him to express support for the project which would facilitate integration of these records into local online catalogs and circulation systems, and therefore result in increased visibility of government documents in a library collection. However, Mr. Kennickell's response to members letters continues to be noncommital.

In March, the Office of Management and Budget released its long awaited draft circular on the management of federal information resources. ARL staff is preparing a response to the draft OMB circular which expresses serious concern about the future availability of government information should this circular be adopted. For example, the GPO Depository Library Program, while mentioned in the introduction, is not listed in the text of the circular as a mechanism for public dissemination of government information. In addition, the circular is silent on the obligation of the federal government to disseminate information collected or created with taxpayer funds.

Reauthorizaton of NEH and HEA

Two laws of great importance to research libraries are due for reauthorization: legislation establishing the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and the Higher Education Act (HEA). ARL is working closely with the National Humanities Alliance (NHA) on NEH reauthorization. The NHA is a coalition of over 50 professional organizations with an interest in the NEH. I have been elected to the Executive Committee and participated in the development of the NHA strategy for NEH reauthorization. ARL will be represented when Congressional hearings begin in earnest.

Regarding reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, in December, William D. Ford (D-MI), Chairman, and E. Thomas Colemen (R-MO), ranking minority member, of the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, invited ARL to submit recommendations for modification or addition to the HEA. ARL staff worked closely with the American Library Association to develop joint recommendations for changes in Titles II and VI. ARL took responsibility for developing recommendations for Title II-C (no substantive changes in the language of the law and modest increases in the authorization levels), Title II-D (a proposal for a new college library technology and cooperative grant program), and Title VI-A (a proposal for a new program to assist libraries in acquiring periodicals published outside the United States). Details of the recommendations submitted by ARL and ALA appear in the May issue of the ARL Newsletter. Staff will continue to work with members of Congress during the reauthorization process, which is expected to continue into 1986.

Federal Budget for 1986

As expected, President Reagan proposed a federal budget for fiscal year 1986 that recommends zero funds for library programs (HEA Title II programs and LSCA) and for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, as well as elimination of postal subsidies which support the library rate. In addition, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library were all targeted for budget cuts.

ARL was represented by Lawrence Towner, President and Librarian at the Newberry Library, before the House subcommittee considering the NEH budget for 1986. Mr. Towner testified in support of the newly established Presevation Office within NEH and called for Congress to supply funds that would support this office without threatening other programs of the Endowment. ARL will be represented when hearings are called for consideration of the budget for library programs administered by the Department of Education.

To assist ALA in preparing testimony in support of continuing postal subsidies, ARL staff contacted six member libraries which provided information to update a 1981 ARL survey of postage expenses. As a result, the Office was able to supply ALA with five-year trends of postal expenses in six research libraries which were located in the states of key members of the Congressional committee considering the postal subsidy issue.

ARL was represented at hearings on the Library of Congress 1986 budget request by Joseph Rosenthal, University of California, Berkeley, and Maureen Patterson, recently retired South Asian Librarian from the University of Chicago and presently Research Associate at UC Berkeley. Both spoke in support of LC programs, emphasizing the need to continue the acquisition and cataloging of materials collected by the LC Office in New Delhi, India.

The outlook for funding all these programs in 1986 remains uncertain. While they have received support in Congress in the past, the budget process is more difficult this year due to the emphasis placed on reducing the federal deficit. New members in Congress as well as long time supporters of library programs need to be contacted to ask for their vote for an appropriation of at least the same level as these programs received in 1985.

Conclusion

ARL's activities represent a cooperative team approach to pursuing the objectives in the ARL Plan of Action. Thanks and appreciation are due for the work of the members who participate on the Board of Directors, on ARL committees and task forces, in the Legislative Network, and through other programs and activities of the Association. It is only through the continued interest and contributions of members that ARL may play an effective role in the future of research libraries.

APPENDIX B

CLR COUNCIL ON LIBRARY RESOURCES
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20036 • Tel: 202-483-7474

REPORT TO THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRAIES (ARL) OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (BSDP)

MAY 15, 1985

The Bibliographic Service Development Program (BSDP) of the Council on Library Resources continues to push forward toward its goal of improving bibliographic services to all library users, especially those in academic and research environments. This report is organized according to the major budget elements of the program. Additional information concerning any of the mentioned topics is available from any CLR staff member, but most readily available from either Barbara Dean, program associate or C. Lee Jones, program consultant.

STANDARDS AND GUIDES:

1. The Association of American Publishers' project to create a set of codes for manuscripts in electronic form is now in the testing phase. The codes have been created, a set of author guidelines have been written and are being published, and over a hundred authors are at work testing the codes as they prepare some or all of their current manuscripts using the codes. At this point, the codes must be actively inserted by the author. Once the codes achieve the status of a standard, or seem to be heading in that direction, it is expected that certain of the software companies will include the codes as part of their word-processing packages. Reports have been given on the project at a number of meetings in the last year and more are scheduled in the coming months.

2. The Council awarded a small grant to NISO to pay the costs of assuming the responsibility of providing secretariat services for ISO Technical Committee 49. This group will be dealing with the telecommunication protocols that will flow from the Linked Systems Project into NISO and finally into the international standards arena.

ACCESS TO BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA:

1. Retrospective conversion (RECON) of records from a variety of formats into machine-readable form has monopolized a substantial amount of time in the last several months. CLR staff drafted a national RECON plan for the music library community and they have since modified it and have received some Title IIC support to put the national plan to work. In a related vein,

CLR provided ARL with a modest grant to study the dimensions of the problem and to produce a draft national plan for RECON for large research libraries.

2. Reports of two meetings held at the Spring Hill Conference Center outside of Minneapolis last summer have been produced and distributed. These reports formed the background of the work alluded to in the previous item.

LINK BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATABASES:

1. The Council has provided support for OCLC to become a participant in the Linked Systems Project. Capitalizing on the work done to date, it is likely that they will be able to begin testing at about the same time that the other organizations are ready for full testing.

2. The original three participants are getting close to an operational system. LC has completed work on record distribution and record contribution as well as search and retrieval. RLG will complete work on record distribution very shortly, if it is not actually complete. They will finish contribution by August. WLN will finish both distribution and contribution in August and all three and possibly OCLC will begin testing these two segments of the system. Search and retrieval software will be tested later in the year. Pilot implementation is now likely to begin the first of 1986, with prompt expansion to all NACO participants shortly thereafter. Plans are now being made for two groups, a technical advisory group and a management group for the Linked Systems Project in its operational mode. The technical advisory group will include members beyond the four LSP institutions.

3. The state libraries under the coordination of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries has produced a document describing requirements for the linking of vendor systems when supported with state-managed funds. The document is available from the Oklahoma Department of Libraries.

4. A meeting of organizations interested in the LSP protocols was held at the Library of Congress in January. A follow-on meeting will be held in Chicago during the ALA annual meeting under the sponsorship of NISO.

SUBJECT AUTHORITY STRUCTURE AND SUBJECT ACCESS:

1. The OCLC/Forest Press project to examine how the Dewey Decimal Classification System might be used to enhance subject access in an online catalog environment was reviewed by a set of CLR advisors at the projects midpoint. Suggestions for enhancing subsequent work were made. Since the review, the pilot system has been installed at the Public Library of Columbus and Franklin County and at the Library of Congress for brief periods of evaluation and study. The project is scheduled for completion in early 1986, followed by a CLR meeting on the use of classification in subject searching.

CONSER:

1. The CONSER A&I project has passed a milestone. The coding of existing CONSER records with notice of coverage by one or more A&I service has been completed.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC PRODUCTS AND SERVICES:

1. The Council organized and conducted a meeting on online catalog screen displays in March at the Lakeway Conference Center just outside Austin, Texas. Preceding the meeting and providing the grist for the discussion mill was an online catalog fair during which 23 systems were demonstrated and evaluated. During the meeting itself, Alan Kay, one of the originators of the bit-mapped display, and now a fellow at Apple Computers, provided a stimulating review of where computing has been and where it ought to be going. Proceedings will be available within a few weeks.

2. Proceedings of a meeting in Baltimore in the Fall of 1983 were finally published. The meeting, focused on design issues in online catalogs, spawned a second meeting focused on screen displays and command languages. Proceedings of that meeting are also available from the Council.

3. A final report on a grant to New York University Libraries for study of the utility of an online catalog was received. At nearly the same time, because of delays in implementing an online catalog at Columbia University, an extension was granted on the project to assess the impact on library service of an online catalog.

USER GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION:

1. A final report was received from Northwestern University on the grant to evaluate alternate online catalog user training strategies. The key element in that project was the use of transaction log analysis to evaluate various strategies.

APPENDIX C

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 232-8656

April 26, 1985

To: ARL Board of Directors

From: Office of Management Studies (OMS)

Re: Status of OMS Programs
October 1984 - April 1985

I. Separately Funded and Developmental Projects

A. General Electric Foundation/Public Services Study: Final reports are now available from the seven self-studies and the seven sponsored research projects. All projects were completed by the end of 1984 and a final report on the two year, $250,000 effort was prepared and submitted to the Foundation in February 1985. A revised Public Services Study Manual is now available to guide future self-studies and new studies were begun in January 1985 at Boston University and the University of California, Santa Barbara. A review of the Public Services Study will be a part of the ARL membership meeting in May 1985.

B. Program to Support National and Regional Cooperative Collection Development: A proposal for Phase III of the National Collections Inventory Project (NCIP) was prepared and submitted to the Mellon Foundation in April 1984 following discussions with the ARL Board, the ARL Committee on Collection Development and RLG representatives.

The proposed project builds on the work of the Research Libraries Group (RLG) and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) carried out since 1979 in the development of a standard approach to describing and assessing research library collections in specific subject areas covering the full range of scholarly interests. The primary goals of the proposed project include: the development of fifteen geographically-dispersed research library staff as trainers available to assist libraries participating in NCIP; the education of scholars and public service librarians in the uses and potential benefits of the Inventory; the identification of important specialized collections in non-research libraries; the development of strategies for substantive cooperation among research libraries, considering the Collections Inventory as a supporting instrument for such decisions; and the design and operation of procedures for the ongoing management and coordination of the North American Collections Inventory.

The project covers three years and has a total proposed budget of $236,784. Contributed resources from ARL and participating libraries are described in the proposal.

C. Institute on Research Libraries for Library Science Faculty: Following the conduct of a successful first Institute in July 1984, a proposal to conduct additional Institutes was prepared and submitted to the Council on Library Resources in the fall. The Council endorsed the idea of one additional Institute to be held in 1986 at a somewhat reduced cost level. A revised proposal was submitted to the Council outlining in greater detail the need for requested funding. At the end of April, the CLR awarded a grant of $45,000 to support the 1986 Institute.

D. National Endowment for the Humanities/Preservation Planning Studies: Ten libraries were selected to participate in the Preservation Planning Program as part of the two-year demonstration project funded by a $65,375 grant from NEH. Two libraries - Colorado State and the State University of New York, Stony Brook - began six month preservation studies in December 1984. Northwestern University Libraries, the Center for Research Libraries, the Smithsonian Institution, the University of Oregon and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville begin studies in the next two months. And Iowa State University, Ohio State University and the University of Missouri, Columbia will begin studies in the Fall.

II. Core OMS Programs Supported by Cost Recovery Efforts and the ARL Dues Allotment

A. Development of new projects or services:

- The preliminary version of an Automation Inventory of ARL Members was issued in December 1984. Based on members' suggestions and reactions from the ARL Board of Directors and the ARL Statistics Committee, a revised data gathering form was designed and distributed in January 1985. A $3,500 allocation from the Council on Library Resources was secured to finance the design of software to support a method to gather estimated automation expenditures from member libraries. To date, over 70 libraries have provided data on systems and equipment, and nearly 50 have provided expenditure figures. The progress and possible future uses for this project will be discussed at greater length during a meeting of the ARL Committee on Management of Research Libraries at the Spring ARL membership meeting.

- The concept of an Analytical Skills Institute was approved by the ARL Committee on Management of Research Libraries and the design, scheduling, publicity and registration process for two Institutes to be held in 1985 was completed during the Winter. The first Institute will be held at the University of Pittsburgh on June 2-5, 1985. The second Institute will be held in San Diego, California on December 1-4, 1985.

- The grant proposal to design a technical services review was further refined based on reactions of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control and the need to relate this project to the efforts to establish a national retrospective conversion project.

B. Academic Library Program: During this period nine self-studies were operational in the Office: four collection studies, two public services studies, one academic library development study, one small library planning study, and one preservation study.

C. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center: During this period six SPEC Flyers and Kits were issued covering the topics of: Strategic Planning #108 (October), Staff Training for Automation #109 (November-December), Local Cataloging Policies in ARL Libraries #110 (January), Cooperative Collection Development #111 (February), Automation and Reorganization of Technical and Public Services #112 (March); and Preservation Education in ARL Libraries #113 (April).

The Center answered some 98 requests for information loans of files, and from research projects. A new service involves quick, targeted inquiries to member libraries. Library directors sometimes require information from other ARL members very quickly. To respond to the need, SPEC expanded its on-demand surveys to include a "QUICK-SPEC' service: member libraries commission SPEC to gather information on a particular topic or issue. If the topic is of general interest to the membership and helpful for other projects or programs, SPEC agrees to do a QUICK-SPEC survey. A simple-to-answer questionnaire is developed along with a list of the most appropriate target libraries. Results are back to the participating libraries within two or three weeks, and the resulting files are available to other members, for a cost-recovery charge.

The Center issued an occasional paper on the topic of "Performance Measurement for Public Services in Academic and Research Libraries", #9, by Mary J. Cronin, February 1985. 20 ARL library staff are involved in the OMS-sponsored Collaborative Research Writing Program which involves preparing publications.

D. The Training and Staff Development Program: During this period the following training events were conducted:

- A Basic Management Skills Institute in Chicago, Illinois in October 1984 with 34 participants.
- An Advanced Management Skills Institute in Annapolis, Maryland in November 1984 with 31 participants.
- A sponsored Basic Management Skills Institute at the University of Saskatchewan with 20 participants.
- A Management Institute for ARL Directors in Washington, D.C. in February 1985 with 17 participants.
- An Advanced Management Skills Institute in Berkeley, California in March 1985 with 22 participants.
- A Basic Management Skills Institute in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania in April 1985 with 45 participants.

In addition several special focus workshops were held including Performance Appraisal at North Carolina State University, and Adjusting to Change at Southern Illinois University.

The 1985 schedule of Management Skills Institutes was augmented with several sponsored Institutes and now includes:

Basic

May 6-9, 1985	Houston, Texas*
June 17-20, 1985	Ithaca, New York*
September 17-20, 1985	Gainesville, Florida*
September 29-October 3, 1985	Gainesville, Florida*
August 25-28, 1985	Cleveland, Ohio*
October 27-30, 1985	Denver, Colorado

Advanced

November 4-8, 1985	Chicago, Illinois* **
November 17-22, 1985	Boston, Massachusetts

Analytical Skills

June 2-5, 1985	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*
December 1-4, 1985	San Diego, California

* sponsored
** tentative

E. OMS Annual Report: The 1984 Annual Report was prepared and distributed to ARL members in April 1984. It describes ARL membership services as well as progress on separately funded projects.

The report details new directions taken in 1984, including a Management Institute for ARL Directors, an Institute on Research Libraries for Library School Faculty funded by the Council on Library Resources, and an Automation Inventory project. Also described are concluding work on the two-year General Electric grant-funded portion of the Public Services Study, and the initial work on a two-year grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to sponsor Preservation Planning Programs at 10 member libraries. Progress on the North American Collections Inventory Project, supported by the Lilly Endowment, also is described.

Plans presented for 1985 include two new Analytical Skills Institutes, ten basic and advanced Management Skills Institutes, ten SPEC kits/flyers, and a revised Automation Inventory with financial information.

III. OMS Staff Work with ARL Committees

A. ARL Committee on Management of Research Libraries: The committee reviewed OMS program priorities established for 1985.

B. ARL Committee on Library Education: An expanded group based on this committee was alerted to developments with the Institute on Research Libraries for Library Science Faculty.

C. ARL Task Force on Research Library Staffing: OMS staff assisted the task force in leading discussion of ARL directors on organizational projections for research libraries. Subsequently, help was provided in drafting a task force report.

D. ARL Collection Management Committee: The committee advised OMS staff in the development of the NCIP Phase III proposal submitted to the Andrew Mellon Foundation.

E. ARL Statistics Committee: Committee members and OMS staff are coordinating efforts to improve and update statistics-gathering, and are pooling knowledge regarding survey techniques.

APPENDIX D

Excerpts from the Office of Management Studies
1984 Annual Report

I. Introduction

Most observers agree that research libraries will rethink and reorder program priorities, organizational structures and operational practices over the next ten years. The nature of these institutions is changing due to the combination of complex communication technology, the automation of library operations, economic and demographic trends influencing university interests, and changes in the way scholarly information is generated, distributed and used.

Since its inception in 1970, the Office of Management Studies has sought to help research libraries develop initiatives in response to such powerful forces. The Office's goal is to improve the capacity of research libraries to manage their resources in the face of demands to improve performance frequently with diminished traditional sources of support. A key ingredient in today's rapidly changing environment is the development of strategic thinking and responses.

Strategic response implies anticipating rather than reacting to changes in the environment, and calls for a future-oriented rather than status quo posture. Strategic thinking implies a timely scanning of external environmental developments in order to address internal problems and understand internal politics. From this approach come fundamental shifts in programs and priorities rather than simple projections of current capacities into the future.

Finding new ways of putting together public services was one contemporary challenge for research libraries addressed by OMS programs in 1984. With support from the General Electric Foundation the Office designed a Public Services Study, now available for use by individual libraries. Work on seven self-studies and seven sponsored research projects led to the identification of several strategic concerns:

- The need to clarify and extend services for a variety of client groups with different and sometimes conflicting needs;
- The need to use existing staff in the best possible ways, and to improve the productivity and effectiveness of staff in areas where there are few concrete performance measures;
- The requirement that libraries take an active role in the creation of the new information networks that can be established with new communication technology linking campus and national capabilities;
- The advantages of concentrating on the requirements of those who seek information rather than on the techniques by which it can be provided;
- The need to increase libraries' interaction with the scholarly disciplines;
- The recognition that the role of the library and its relationship to a variety of client groups may be redefined, realizing that the library is not the sole or even, perhaps, the principal source of information;
- The movement toward striking a new balance between warehousing information resources and actively pursuing information services and identifying and incorporating technologies for the delivery of services, information, and material; and
- The need to find effective ways to engage the media of the electronic age.

At a time when many research libraries are considering new directions in programs and services, the Public Services Study can help accelerate their efforts, and provide support to assure more useful results.

A second emphasis for the Office in 1984 was a survey of members to acquire information on the status of technology in research libraries. The Automation Inventory of Research Libraries provides descriptive information on the hardware, software, and systems ARL libraries use to support 22 library functions. The draft inventory, issued at the end of the year, illustrates the extent to which libraries are using available technology. An enhanced version planned for 1985 is designed to help library administrators answer questions about the impact of technology on their priorities, distribution of resources, and organizational structures.

A third emphasis of the Office was collection management. Current work builds on the experience of the Collection Analysis Project (CAP), developed in 1977, which assists libraries in examining the philosophy and practice of materials fund allocation, as well as the processes of selection, organization and staffing, assesment of collections, resource sharing, and preservation. The CAP project has underscored the importance of systematic collection description as a step toward policy analysis, more rigorous monitoring of collection growth and selectors' performance, and deliberate resource sharing. As a result, the Office worked with the Research Libraries Group to develop the North American Collections Inventory Program, with the advice of the ARL Committee on Collection Development. This program is providing guidance, training, and tools for preparing collection descriptions that are comparable among research libraries.

Development of those leadership and staff skills required to meet new needs were another emphasis of the Office in 1984. The ongoing OMS training program strengthens personnel capabilities through Management Skills Institutes and Special Focus Workshops; new in 1984 were a Management Institute for Directors and an Institute on Research Libraries for Library Science Faculty. The directors' program dealt with three themes: role of library directors in the university, strategic planning, and organizational change. The library science faculty engaged the reality of contemporary research libraries through seminars led by university and library administrators, week-long field visits to major research libraries, and small group discussions among the faculty and research libraries.

In the next year the Office will continue to identify and address emerging issues in the management of research libraries. A new training program will focus on analytical skills. Funds to support development of a technical services self-study will be sought, and the Automation Inventory of Research Libraries will be revised and updated.

II. Highlights of OMS Activities in 1984

Twenty-eight libraries participated in self-study programs during 1984. Seven libraries completed Public Services in Research Libraries studies, thirteen worked on Collection Analysis Projects, and three libraries began the Preservation Planning Program. One library was active in the Academic Library Development Program, two conducted Planning Program for Small Academic Libraries projects, and two worked with Organizational Screening programs.

The OMS received a two-year, $65,375 National Endowment for the Humanities grant to conduct Preservation Planning Program self-studies in ten ARL libraries: the Center for Research Libraries, Colorado State University, Iowa State University, University of Missouri-Columbia, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, University of Oregon, Smithsonian Institution, State University of New York at Stony Brook, and the University of Tennessee. During the first six months of the grant, the Office began Advisory Committee activities, recruited and selected test libraries, completed scheduling and consultant assignments, and began two studies.

With financial support of $250,000 from the General Electric Foundation, seven ARL libraries completed demonstration self-studies in the Public Services in Research Libraries Project, while seven research teams at ARL libraries concluded research activities. The Public Services Project moved toward completion of the two-year effort, with a January 1985 closure date.

The North American Collections Inventory Project, under a $90,000 grant from the Lilly Endowment, began Phase II activities in January 1984. Procedures and resources developed during Phase I were tested at Indiana University, the University of Notre Dame, and Purdue University. These include improved documentation and training resources for future participants.

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center issued 10 kits/flyers, maintained 400 subscriptions, distributed over 6,000 publications, and handled more than 1,000 publication and information requests. The Center conducted five surveys, refined its survey program to include a new Quick-SPEC inquiry, and produced an electronic mail directory of ARL libraries.

The Office developed an Automation Inventory to provide basic, descriptive information about the status of automation in member libraries. A preliminary edition was published in December 1984.

In the Organizational Training and Staff Development Program, activities included eight Management Skills Institutes, two of which were Advanced Institutes, a Management Institute for Library Directors, and fifteen special focus workshops. Over 1100 librarians participated in OMS training programs during the year.

The OMS designed and conducted a Management Institute for Library Directors. Seventeen directors attended the February 1984 event, which was held in Washington, D.C.

Under a $54,000 grant from the Council on Library Resources, the OMS conducted a three-week Institute on Research Libraries for Library School Faculty in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, during July 1984.

A new event, the Analytical Skills Institute, was designed for the Organizational Training and Staff Development Program. Two Institutes will be held in 1985.

The Office developed a paper on "Organizational Projections for Assessing Future Research Library Staffing Needs and Prospects," with the advice and guidance of the ARL Task Force on Staffing.

VII. OMS Priorities for 1985

Academic Library Program

In the ALP, it is anticipated that the public services, collection analysis and preservation planning programs will attract most member participation. The OMS expects to begin about 10 new library self-studies during 1985, with OMS staff sharing the workload with consultant trainees.

Information Exchange and Publications Program

During 1985, SPEC will continue its Kit/Flyer publication schedule, working with an increased number of researchers and writers from ARL member libraries. Increased attention will be given to developing databases, specialized listings and on-demand surveys. SPEC expects to conduct 5-10 on-demand surveys and no more than three all-member suveys. Next year's work will incorporate use of electronic mail to improve communications with SPEC liaisons in member libraries.

Organizational Training and Staff Development

The 1985 training program includes two Basic Management Skills Institutes, two Advanced Management Skills Institutes, and six Special Focus Workshops. In addition, a second Management Institute for ARL Directors is scheduled. Both the Basic and the Advanced Management Skills Institute Notebooks will be revised.

During 1984, the Office planned a new type of event to be offered with the Organizational Training and Staff Development Program: the Analytical Skills Institute. Focusing on the processes and skills needed to study library operations and plan improvements, the Institute will help library managers to improve their ability to formulate questions about library operations and to identify techniques that are useful for exploring issues. It will help strengthen skills in using these techniques to observe, diagnose, and take the actions required for change. There will be opportunities to gain experience in using a variety of tools and techniques.

The event is planned as a three and one-half day Institute, with enrollment limited to 35. Two Analytical Skills Institutes are planned for 1985.

Applied Research and Development

During 1985, the Office will establish methods for working with a larger number of researchers and writers. Two Occasional Papers will be published.

Phase III of the North American Collections Inventory should be in operation during 1985. Plans are under way to secure funding for implementation of NCIP throughout the continent, and to train staff members for NCIP participation in libraries throughout the U.S. and Canada. Support services for NCIP will be maintained, and Office staff will continue to work with RLG to develop the Conspectus. Project staff will also continue to benefit from the advice of the ARL Task Force on Collection Development.

Last year's annual report mentioned development of a new self-study for technical services. During 1984, the self-study has been refined, and in 1985 the office plans to secure funding to further develop, and to test and operate the Technical Services Self-Study.

The Office has assurance of funding for a second Institute on Research Libraries for Library Science Faculty, to be operated in 1986. During 1985, staff will design the workshop, secure speakers and staff, develop and distribute publicity, and conduct a national search for participants.

In the NEH Preservation Planning Project, the Office plans to complete current studies, and begin new projects as requested by members. Five librarians will be prepared especially for consultation work with preservation self-studies.

Several activities presently under way will be completed during the upcoming year. Work with the ARL Research Libraries' Staffing Task Force will end with the production of a report. In the Public Services Project, staff will publish the public services manual, and there will be a presentation of project results at the spring ARL membership meeting. After project activities have been completed, the study will be operated on a cost recovery basis within the Academic Library Program.

In addition to the regular program priorities, OMS staff are increasingly involved in working with ARL committees on an as needed basis.

Appendix A
Staff and Program Publications
1984

I. General

"The Automation Inventory of Research Libraries. Preliminary Results and Sample Listing For Review and Use by Members of the Association of Research Libraries." Washington, D.C., OMS, December 1984.

Office of Management Studies. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. SPEC Kits and Flyers.

Collection Security	#100, January 1984
User Studies	#101, February 1984
Copyright Policies	#102, March 1984
The Assistant/Associate Director Position	#103, April 1984
Microcomputers	#104, May 1984
Nonbibliographic Machine-Readable Databases	#105, June 1984
Electronic Mail	#106, July-August 1984
University Archives	#107, September 1984
Strategic Planning	#108, October 1984
Staff Training for Automation	#109, November-December 1984

Reed-Scott, Jutta. "Collection Management Strategies for Archivists." American Archivist 47 (Winter 1984) 23-29.

Subject Index to SPEC Kits. Washington, D.C., Fall 1984.

Swanson, Patricia K. "Planning as Job Enrichment: A Case Study." Journal of Academic Librarianship 9 (January 1984) 350-351.

———. "Reference Librarians and Online Catalogs." RQ 23 (Fall 1983) 23-26.

Veaner, Allen B. "The Assistant/Associate Director Position in ARL Libraries." OMS Occasional Paper no. 8. Washington, D.C., OMS, July 1984.

II. Public Services in Research Libraries

Brown University. "Final Report: Public Services Self Study." Washington, D.C., OMS, December 1984.

Task Force Reports: Task Force on User Needs: Sub-Task Force on User Survey; Task Force on Organization and Staffing; Task Force on Interdepartmental Relationships; Task Force on Technology; Task Force on Facilities/Space.

Columbia University. "Public Services in Research Libraries: A Self-Study: Final Report." Washington, D.C., OMS, December 1984.

Task Force Reports: Task Force on Evaluating the Impact on Services of CUL's Participation in Cooperative Arrangements; Task Force on University Library User Community Interim Report; Task Force on University Library User Community Final Report; Task Force to Study the Effect of Interdepartmental Relationships on Services; Task Force on Articulating Public Services; Task Force on Technology and Public Services.

Dodd, Jane, Charles Gilreath, and Geraldine Hutchins. "A Comparison of Two End User Operated Search Systems: Final Report from Texas A & M University." Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

Greenfield, Louise, Jeanne Pfander, Chris Sherratt, and Karen Williams. "Assessing the Instructional Needs of Students in a Selected Scientific Discipline at the University of Arizona." Final report from the University of Arizona. Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

Kranich, Nancy C., Christina M. Spellman, Deborah Hecht, and Gail Persky. "A Study of an Online Catalog from a Public Services Perspective: Final Report from New York University." Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

Larson, Mary Ellen, and Dace Freivalds. "The Effect of an Instruction Program on Online Catalog Users: Final Report from Pennsylvania State University." Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

Link, Terry, Kriss Ostrom, Agnes Haigh, and Philip Marcus. "Non-Users of the MSU Libraries: An Assessment of Characteristics, Perceptions, and Needs at Michigan State University. Final report from Michigan State University." Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

McCandless, Patricia, Margaret Chaplan, Barton M. Clark, David F. Kohl, Dee Wallace, and Lucille Wert. "The Invisible User: User Needs Assessment for Library Public Services. Final report from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign." Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

Michigan State University. "Report of the Study Team, Office of Management Studies Public Services Study." Washington, D.C., OMS, 1984.

Task Force Reports: Distribution and Use of Staff; Facilities; Library Instruction; Periodicals Access/Control; Undergraduate Student Services; User Needs.

Newberry Library. "Public Services in Research Libraries: A Self-Study." Washington, D.C., OMS, August 1984.

Additional Publications: Profile of the Newberry Library; Services Points, Traffic and Communication; Bibliographic Access and Control; Reference Collections; Staffing and Operations.

Olsen, Jan Kennedy, Joan K. Lippincott, and Bill Coons. "Appropriate Public Services for Agricultural Research Faculty: Final Report from Cornell University." Washington, D.C., OMS, January 1985.

"Preliminary Reports from the Public Services Research Projects." Washington, D.C., OMS, September 1984.

Temple University. "Office of Management Studies Public Service Study: Final Report of the Study Team." Washington, D.C., OMS, December, 1984.

Task Force Reports: Task Force on Organization of Public Services; Task Force on Staffing and Management; Task Force on Public Services and Technology; Task Force on Users and Their Changing Needs.

University of California, Riverside. "Public Services in Research Libraries: A Self-Study." Washington, D.C., OMS, June 1984.

Additional Publications: Description and Inventory of Services; Library Profile-UCR; PROFILE: University of California, Riverside; Task Force on the Role of the Library in the Future; Task Force on Articulating the Library's PSS; Report of the Service Performance and Service Needs Task Force; Report of the Task Force on Technology & Public Service; Report of the Task Force on Organization, Staffing & Management.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Academic Affairs Library. "Public Services in Research Libraries: Final Report of the Study Team, October, 1, 1984." Washington, D.C., OMS, August 1984.

Task Force Reports: Task Force on Organization, Management and Staffing; Task Force on User Needs, Service Performance, and the Promotion of Public Services; Task Force on Internal Communication; Task Force on Technology and Public Services.

III. Collection Analysis Project

Duke University. William R. Perkins Library. "Collection Analysis Project, Final Report." Durham, North Carolina, August, 1984.

Task Force Reports: Organization and Staffing (June, 1984); Allocation of Materials Funds

(June 15, 1984); Assessment (June 15, 1984); Collection Policies (June 15, 1984).

University of Michigan. "Executive Summary, Collection Analysis Project." Ann Arbor, Michigan, May 1983.

Task Force Reports: Allocation (May 1983); Collection Assessment (April 1983); New Needs and Possibilities Phase I Report (September 1, 1982); Organization (May 1983); Preservation (October 27, 1982); Resource Sharing (n.d.)

Widener University, Chester, Pa. "Wolfgram Memorial Library Collection Analysis Project." Chester, Pa., February 1984.

Task Force Reports: Materials Fund Allocations (February 1984); Organization and Selection (November 1983); Resource Sharing (February 1984); Collection Assessment (November 1983).

APPENDIX E

ATTENDANCE AT 106th MEMBERSHIP MEETING
Cincinnati, Ohio

May 15-17, 1985

University of Alabama Libraries
Douglas E. Jones

University of Alberta Library
Not Represented

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Riggs

Boston Public Library
Liam M. Kelly

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Sterling J. Albrecht

University of British Columbia Library
Not Represented

Brown University Library
Merrily Taylor

University of California, Berkeley Library
Joseph Rosenthal

University of California, Davis Library
Jane Marshall

University of California, Irvine Library
Calvin J. Boyer

University of California, Los Angeles Library
Russell Shank

University of California, Riverside Library
Joan Chambers

University of California, San Diego Library
Phyllis S. Mirsky

University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Joseph A. Boissé

Canada Inst. for Scientific & Technical Info.
Elmer V. Smith

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Susan Coté

Center for Research Libraries
Karla Petersen

University of Chicago Library
Martin D. Runkle

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Charles B. Osburn

University of Colorado Library
Leo Cabell

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Patricia Battin

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
Louis E. Martin

Dartmouth College Libraries
Margaret A. Otto

University of Delaware Library
Susan Brynteson

Duke University Libraries
Jerry D. Campbell

Emory University Library
Herbert F. Johnson

University of Florida Libraries
Dale Canelas

Florida State University Library
Not Represented

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
David F. Bishop

Georgia Institute of Technology Library
Not Represented

University of Guelph Library
John Black

Harvard University Library
Sidney Verba

University of Hawaii Library
John R. Haak

University of Houston Libraries
Robin Downes

Howard University Libraries
Not Represented

University of Illinois Library
Hugh C. Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
Elaine F. Sloan

University of Iowa Libraries
Dale M. Bentz

Iowa State University Library
Warren B. Kuhn

Johns Hopkins University Library
Susan K. Martin

University of Kansas Library
Mary Hawkins

University of Kentucky Libraries
Paul A. Willis

Kent State University Libraries
Don Tolliver

Library of Congress
Lucia Rather

Linda Hall Library
Larry X. Besant

Louisiana State University Library
Sharon Hogan

McGill University Library
Hans Möller

McMaster University Library
Graham R. Hill

University of Manitoba Libraries
Earl Ferguson

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard J. Talbot

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Librs.
Jay K. Lucker

University of Miami Library
Ronald Naylor

University of Michigan Library
Richard M. Dougherty

Michigan State University Library
Richard E. Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Eldred Smith

University of Missouri Library
Thomas W. Shaughnessy

National Agricultural Library
Not Represented

National Library of Canada
Marianne Scott

National Library of Medicine
Lois A. Colaianni

University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries
Not Represented

Newberry Library
Not Represented

University of New Mexico Library
Paul Vassallo

New York Public Library
Arthur Curley

New York State Library
Joseph F. Shubert

New York University Libraries
Carlton Rochell

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

North Carolina State University Library
I.T. Littleton

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Robert C. Miller

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
Sul H. Lee

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
George W. Shipman

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Anne Woodsworth

Princeton University Library
Donald Koepp

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University Library
Margot B. McBurney

Rice University Library
Samuel Carrington

University of Rochester Libraries
James F. Wyatt

Rutgers University Library
Hendrik Edelman

University of Saskatchewan Library
Not Represented

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Robert Maloy

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern California Library
Not Represented

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State Univ. of New York at Albany Libraries
Joseph Z. Nitecki

State Univ. of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Not Represented

State Univ. of New York at Stony Brook Library
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Pauline Miller

Temple University Library
James Myers

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Linda Beaupre

Texas A & M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
    Roy Bonin

Tulane University Library
    Philip E. Leinbach

University of Utah Libraries
    Roger K. Hanson

Vanderbilt University Library
    Malcolm Getz

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
    Thomas A. Souter

University of Virginia Libraries
    Ray Frantz, Jr.

University of Washington Library
    Charlene Renner

Washington State University Library
    Donald Bushaw

Washington University Libraries
    Charles Churchwell

University of Waterloo Library
    Murray C. Shepherd

Wayne State University Libraries
    Peter Spyers-Duran

University of Western Ontario Library
    Robert Lee

University of Wisconsin Libraries
    Frank Bright

Yale University Libraries
    Millicent Abell

York University Libraries
    Ellen Hoffmann

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.	Yale University Libraries
Albrecht, Sterling J.	Brigham Young University Library
Anderson, Le Moyne W.	Colorado State University Library
Atkinson, Hugh C.	University of Illinois Library
Battin, Patricia	Columbia University Libraries
Beaupre, Linda	University of Texas Libraries
Bentz, Dale M.	University of Iowa Libraries
Besant, Larry X.	Linda Hall Library
Bishop, David F.	University of Georgia Libraries
Black, John	University of Guelph Library
Boissé, Joseph A.	University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Bonin, Roy	University of Toronto Libraries
Boyer, Calvin J.	University of California, Irvine Library
Bright, Frank	University of Wisconsin Libraries
Brynteson, Susan	University of Delaware Library
Bushaw, Donald	Washington State University Library
Cabell, Leo	University of Colorado Library
Campbell, Jerry D.	Duke University Libraries
Canelas, Dale	University of Florida Libraries
Carrington, Samuel	Rice University Library
Chambers, Joan	University of California, Riverside Library
Chapin, Richard E.	Michigan State University Library
Churchwell, Charles	Washington University Libraries
Colaianni Lois A.	National Library of Medicine
Coté, Susan	Case Western Reserve University Library
Curley, Arthur	New York Public Library
Dagnese, Joseph M.	Purdue University Library
De Gennaro, Richard	University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Dougherty, Richard M.	University of Michigan Library
Downes, Robin	University of Houston Libraries
Edelman Hendrik	Rutgers University Library
Ferguson, Earl	University of Manitoba Libraries
Forth, Stuart	Pennsylvania State University Library
Frantz, Ray	University of Virginia Libraries
Getz, Malcolm	Vanderbilt University Library
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Haak, John R.	University of Hawaii Library
Hanson, Roger K.	University of Utah Libraries
Harrar, H. Joanne	University of Maryland Library
Hawkins, Mary	University of Kansas Library
Hill, Graham R.	McMaster University Library
Hoadley, Irene B.	Texas A&M University Library

Hoffmann, Ellen	York University Libraries
Hogan, Sharon	Louisiana State University Library
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Jeffs, Joseph E.	Georgetown University Library
Johnson, Herbert F.	Emory University Library
Jones, Douglas E.	University of Alabama Libraries
Kelly, Liam M.	Boston Public Library
Koepp, Donald	Princeton University Library
Kuhn, Warren B.	Iowa State University Library
Laird, W. David	University of Arizona Library
Laucas, John	Boston University Library
Lee, Robert	University of Western Ontario Library
Lee, Sul H.	University of Oklahoma Library
Leinbach, Philip E.	Tulane University Library
Littleton, I.T.	North Carolina State University Library
Lucker, Jay K.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
McBurney, Margot B.	Queen's University Library
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McGowan, John P.	Northwestern University Libraries
Maloy, Robert	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Marshall, Jane	University of California, Davis Library
Martin, Louis E.	Cornell University Libraries
Martin, Susan K.	Johns Hopkins University Library
Miller, Pauline	Syracuse University Libraries
Miller, Robert C.	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Mirsky, Phyllis	University of California, San Diego Library
Môller, Hans	McGill University Library
Myers, James	Temple University Library
Nitecki, Joseph Z.	State University of New York at Albany Libraries
Naylor, Ronald P.	University of Miami Library
Osburn, Charles B.	University of Cincinnati Libraries
Otto, Margaret A.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Petersen, Karla	Center for Research Libraries
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Rather, Lucia	Library of Congress
Renner, Charlene	University of Washington Library
Riggs, Donald	Arizona State University Library
Rochell, Carlton	New York University Libraries
Rosenthal, Joseph	University of California, Berkeley Library
Rouse, Roscoe	Oklahoma State University Library
Bonin, Roy	University of Toronto Libraries
Runkle, Martin D.	University of Chicago Library

Schubert, Joseph F.	New York State Library
Scott, Marianne	National Library of Canada
Shank, Russell	University of California, Los Angeles Library
Shaughnessy, Thomas W.	University of Missouri Library
Shepherd, Murray	University of Waterloo Library
Shipman, George W.	University of Oregon Library
Sloan, Elaine F.	Indiana University Libraries
Smith, Eldred	University of Minnesota Libraries
Smith, Elmer	Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information
Smith, John B.	State University of New York at Stony Brook Library
Souter, Thomas A.	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Libraries
Spyers-Duran, Peter	Wayne State University Libraries
Stude[illegible] William J.	Ohio State University Libraries
Talbot, Richard J.	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Taylor, Marrily	Brown University Library
Tolliver, Don	Kent State University Libraries
Toombs, Kenneth E.	University of South Carolina Libraries
Vassallo, Paul	University of New Mexico Library
Verba, Sidney	Harvard University Library
Weber, David C.	Stanford University Libraries
Willis, Paul A.	University of Kentucky Libraries
Woodsworth, Anne	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Wyatt, James F.	University of Rochester Libraries

Guests

Avram, Henriette	Library of Congress
Branin, Joseph J.	Columbia University - CLR Intern
Brown, Rowland	OCLC, Inc.
Buckland, Michael	University of California System
Burckel, Nicholas C.	University of Chicago - CLR Intern
Cannon, Harold C.	National Endowment for the Humanities, Office of Preservation
Child, Margaret	Smithsonian Institution
Cogswell, Jim	Johns Hopkins University - CLR Intern
Ekman, Richard	National Endowment for the Humanties, Research Division
Finzi, John	Library of Congress
Fry, Ray M.	U.S. Department of Education
Grattidge, Walter	General Electric Foundation
Grendler, Marcella	National Endowment for the Humanities, Research Division
Haas, Warren J.	Council on Library Resources
Harris, Carolyn	University of Georgia - CLR Intern
Holley, Edward G.	University of North Carolina, School of Library Science
Jackson, Arlyne A.	Emory University - CLR Intern
Jones, C. Lee	Council on Library Resources
Marcum, Deanna	Council on Library Resources
McCoy, Richard W.	Research Libraries Group
Metz, Paul	Northwestern Universtiy - CLR Intern
Morris, James M	Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Morton, Herbert	American Council of Learned Societies, Office of Scholarly Communication
Segal, JoAn S.	Association of College & Research Libraries
Sparks, Peter G.	Library of Congress
Vaughn, John	Association of American Universities

ARL Staff

Shirley Echelman, Executive Director
Duane E. Webster, Deputy Executive Director and Director, Office of Management Studies
Jaia Barrett, Program Officer
Nicola Daval, Information Officer
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Associate, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey Heynen, Program Officer
Susan Jurow, Training Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Alex Lichtenstein, Administrative Assistant
Jutta Reed-Scott, Collections Development Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine K. Sitts, Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies

APPENDIX F

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

MAY 1985

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1984-85

Richard J. Talbot, President	
Anne Woodsworth, Vice President & President-Elect	
Eldred Smith, Past President	
Hugh C. Atkinson	(Oct. 1985)
Patricia Battin	(Oct. 1985)
Richard E. Chapin	(Oct. 1987)
Graham R. Hill	(Oct. 1986)
Herbert F. Johnson	(Oct. 1986)
W. David Laird	(Oct. 1986)
Margaret Otto	(Oct. 1987)
Joseph Rosenthal	(Oct. 1987)
Paul Vassallo	(Oct. 1985)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Center for Chinese Research Materials

Samuel Chu, Ohio State University (1986)
Thomas Kennedy, Washington, State University (1986)
Thomas Kuo, University of Pittsburgh (1987)
Leo Oufan Lee, University of Chicago (1987)
Douglas McInnes (1985)
Eugene Wu, Harvard University, Chair (1985)

Staff: Ping feng Chi

ARL Microform Project Cataloging Program

Linda Hamilton, Research Publications, Inc.
Roger Hanson, RLAC
Mary Ellen Jacob, OCLC, Inc.
Martin Joachim, ALA/RLMS
Patricia McClung, RLG alternate
Anita Werling, University Microfilms, Inc.
RLG *
LC *

Staff: Jeffrey Heynen

* Representative to be appointed

CONSER A & I Coverage Project

Linda Bartley, Library of Congress
Brett Butler, In-Four
Thomas Delsey, National Library of Canada
Mary Ellen Jacob, OCLC, Inc.
Jay K. Lucker
Robert S. Tannehill, Jr., Chemical Abstracts Service

Staff: Julia Blixrud

National Collections Inventory Project

David Farrell, Indiana University
Leslie Hume, Research Libraries Group
Paul Mosher, Stanford University
Susan Nutter, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Elaine F. Sloan
David H. Stam

Staff: Jeffrey Gardner

STANDING COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chair

Committee on the Management of Research Library Resources

Richard De Gennaro (1985)
Ellen Hoffmann (1987)
Herbert F. Johnson, (ex officio as Chair of committee on ARL Statistics)
Sul H. Lee (1986)
Jay K. Lucker (1987)
Susan K. Martin (1986)
Joan Chambers, Chair (1985)

Staff: Duane Webster

Committee on ARL Statistics

Calvin J. Boyer (1985)
Richard M. Dougherty (1987)
Gordon Fretwell, University of Massachusetts (Consultant)
Robert Lee (1985)
Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia (Consultant)
Herbert F. Johnson, Chair (1987)

Staff: Nicola Daval

Membership Committee on Nonuniversity Libraries

Robert Maloy (1985)
Donald Riggs (1986)
Marilyn Sharrow, Chair (1985)

Coordinating Committee on Collections and Access

Dale Bentz	(1985)
Susan Brynteson	(1985)
Robert Miller	(ex officio as Chair of the Committee on Collection Development)
David Weber	(ex officio as Chair of the Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials)
Joseph Rosenthal	(ex officio as Chair of the Committee on Bibliographic Control)
Elaine Sloan, Chair	(1986)

Staff: Jaia Barrett

Committee on Bibliographic Control

Henriette Avram, Library of Congress Liaison
David Bishop (1985)
Robin Downes (1987)
Sharon Hogan (1987)
C. Lee Jones, Council on Library Resources (observer)
Martin D. Runkle (1985)
Marianne Scott (1985)
Joseph Rosenthal, Chair (1987)

Staff: Jeffrey Heynen, Jutta Reed-Scott

Committee on Collection Development

Joseph Boissé (1986)
Joseph Dagnese (1985)
Robin Downes (1985)
John Finzi, Library of Congress Liaison
Charles Miller (1986)
Marianne Scott (1985)
Robert Miller, Chair (1986)

Staff: Jeffrey Gardner

Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials

Harold W. Billings (1985)
John Laucus (1986)
Deanna Marcum, Council on Library Resources (observer)
Kenneth G. Peterson (1987)
Peter Sparks, Library of Congress Liaison
David H. Stam (1985)
William J. Studer (1987)
David C. Weber, Chair (1985)

Staff: Jeffrey Heynen

Task Force on Scholarly Communication

Hugh C. Atkinson
Stuart Forth
D. Kaye Gapen
Martin Runkle
George Shipman
William Studer
Charles Osburn, Chair

Staff: Nicola Daval

REPRESENTATIVES

ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee	Joan Chambers
ALA Statistics Coordinating Committee	Nicola Daval
National Information Standards Organization (NISO)	Joanne Harrar
NISO Standards Voting Representative	Shirley Echelman
CONSER Advisory Group	Jeffrey Heynen
Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue	Ray Frantz
LC Cataloging-in-Publication Advisory Group	George Gibbs
LC Network Advisory Committee	William Studer
Society of American Archivists	Herbert Finch, Cornell
Universal Serials & Book Exchange	Joanne Harrar
National Institute of Conservators	David Stam
IFLA Voting Representative	Shirley Echelman
RLG Conspectus Development Task Force	David Farrell

APPENDIX G

Association of Research Libraries
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 232-2466

MEMBERSHIP LIST

MAY 1985

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
Douglas E. Jones, Interim Dean of Univ. Librs.
(205) 348-7561

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J8
Peter Freeman, Librarian
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 621-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Riggs, Librarian
(602) 965-3417

Boston Public Library
Copley Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Liam M. Kelly, Acting Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Library
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Sterling J. Albrecht, Univ. Libn.
(801) 378-2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Douglas McInnes, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Merrily Taylor, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
Joseph Rosenthal, Univ. Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library, Davis
Davis, California 95616
William F. McCoy, Acting University Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California, Irvine
The University Library
P.O. Box 19557
Irvine, California 92713
Calvin J. Boyer, University Librarian
(714) 856-5212

University of California Library, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library, Riverside
P.O. Box 5900
Riverside, California 92517
Joan Chambers, University Librarian
(714) 787-3221

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Phyllis S. Mirsky, Acting Librarian
(619) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
The University Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Joseph A. Boissé, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Canada Institute for Scientific & Technical Information
National Research Council of Canada
Ottawa, Canada K1A OS2
Elmer V. Smith, Director
(613) 993-2341

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
Susan Coté, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
6050 South Kenwood Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Donald B. Simpson, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Martin D. Runkle, Director
(312) 962-8744

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Charles B. Osburn, Vice Provost
for Univ. Libraries
(513) 475-2218

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Patricia Battin, Vice President
& University Librarian
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
Louis E. Martin, Univ. Libn.
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Margaret A. Otto, Librarian
(603) 646-2235

University of Delaware Library
Newark, Delaware 19717-5267
Susan Brynteson, Director
(302) 451-2231

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Florence Blakely, Acting Director
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Herbert F. Johnson, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Dale Canelas, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles E. Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
David Bishop, Director
(404) 542-2716

Georgia Institute of Technology
Price Gilbert Memorial Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30332
Miriam Drake, Director
(404) 894-4510

University of Guelph Library
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1
John Black, Chief Librarian
(519) 824-4120

Harvard University Library
Wadsworth House
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Sidney Verba, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
John R. Haak, Director
(808) 948-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robin Downes, Director
(713) 749-4241

Howard University Libraries
500 Harvard Place, N.W.
Box 1059
Washington, D.C. 20059
Kenneth Wilson, Acting Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
1408 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh C. Atkinson, Univ. Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
Elaine F. Sloan, Dean of Univ. Librs.
(812) 335-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
Dale M. Bentz, Univ. Librarian
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Susan K. Martin, Librarian
(301) 338-8325

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul A. Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Don Tolliver, Director
(216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 287-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Larry X. Besant, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
Sharon Hogan, Director
(504) 388-2217

McGill University Library
3459 McTavish Street
Montreal, Canada H3A 1Y1
Hans Möller, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University Library
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
Graham R. Hill, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4359

The University of Manitoba Libraries
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2
Canada
Earl Ferguson, Director
(204) 474-9881

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay K. Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Frank Rodgers, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Richard M. Dougherty, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Director
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Univ. Librarian
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Thomas W. Shaughnessy, Director
(314) 882-4701

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Joseph H. Howard, Director
(301) 344-4248

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0N4
Marianne Scott, National Librarian
(613) 996-1623

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Donald A. Lindberg, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
The University Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0410
James A. Rawley, Interim Dean of Librs.
(402) 472-2526

The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Joel L. Samuels, Dir. of Lib. Sers.
(312) 943-9090

The University of New Mexico
General Library
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Paul Vassallo, Dean of Lib. Sers.
(505) 277-4241

New York Public Library
Fifth Avenue at 42nd Street
New York, New York 10018
David H. Stam, Director of the
Research Libraries
(212) 930-0708

New York State Library
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12234
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-7676

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, University Librarian
(919) 962-1301

North Carolina State University
D.H. Hill Library
Box 5007
Raleigh, North Carolina 27650
I.T. Littleton, Director
(919) 737-2843

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60211
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Robert C. Miller, Director
(219) 239-5252

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William J. Studer, Director
(614) 422-4241

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Sul H. Lee, Dean, University Librs.
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
Roscoe Rouse, Dean of Lib. Ser.
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
George W. Shipman, Univ. Libn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 898-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
217 Hillman Library
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Anne Woodsworth, Assoc. Provost
for Libraries
(412) 624-0907

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Donald Koepp, University Librarian
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 494-2900

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margot B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77251-1892
Samuel Carrington, Director
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
James F. Wyatt, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Hendrik Edelman, Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada S7N OWO
Nancy A. Brown, Univ. Libn.
and Director of Libraries
(306) 343-4216

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at 10th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Robert Maloy, Director
(202) 357-2240

University of South Carolina Libraries
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Charles R. Ritcheson, Librarian
(213) 743-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2015

State University of New York at Albany
Libraries
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
Joseph Z. Nitecki, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 636-2965

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
Stony Brook, New York 11794
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald C. Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Paley Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Director of Libraries
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1000
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
Sterling C. Evans Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(409) 845-8111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Marilyn Sharrow, Chief Librarian
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
Philip E. Leinbach, Librarian
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger K. Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Vanderbilt University Library
419 21st Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Malcolm Getz, Director
(615) 322-2834

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ.
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
Thomas Souter
Acting Director of Libraries.
(703) 961-5593

University of Virginia
Alderman Library
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026 or 7849

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98194-5610
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Donald Bushaw, Interim Director
of Libraries
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(314) 889-5400

University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1
Murray C. Shepherd, Univ. Libn.
(519) 885-1211)

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Peter Spyers-Duran, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario
DB Weldon Library
London, Ontario, Canada
Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
D. Kaye Gapen, Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Millicent D. Abell, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

York University Libraries
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3
Ellen Hoffmann, Director
(416) 667-2235

0026B 1/85

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

(with supplementary information)
(Modified Cash Basis)

YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984 AND 1983

CANTO, METRO, MEYER & COMPANY
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984 AND 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Auditors' Report 1 & 2

Financial Statements (Modified Cash Basis)

Statements of Assets and Liabilities arising from Cash Transactions 3

Statement of Revenue Collected and Expense Paid and Changes in Fund Balance

General Operating Fund 4

Office of Management Studies 5

Chinese Center Revolving Fund 6

Statements of Changes in Cash 7

Notes to the Financial Statements 8 - 11

Supplementary Information (Modified Cash Basis) 12

General Operating Fund - Schedules of Expenses 13

General Operating Fund - Schedule of Expenses by Function 14

Office of Management Studies - Schedule of Expenses 15

Office of Management Studies - Schedule of Expenses by Function 16

Chinese Center Revolving Fund - Schedules of Expenses 17

Special Programs - Schedule of Operations

Association of Research Libraries 18

Office of Management Studies 19

Special Programs - Schedule of Changes in Unapplied Grant Income

Association of Research Libraries 20

Office of Management Studies 21

CANTO, METRO, MEYER & COMPANY
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
BUILDING 3, SUITE 100
5161 RIVER ROAD
BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20816

JOHN J. CANTO, C. P. A.
STUART D. METRO, C. P. A.
JANET C. MEYER, C. P. A.

JAY W. ODLEN, C. P. A.
DOUGLAS A. RAUSCH, C. P. A.

JOEL A. HERSH
JEAN S. HORAK
ESTELLE C. MARSEL
FARRAND C. PRINDLE
ALAN J. SPATZ
JAMES E. STUNKLE

AREA CODE 301
656-3000

SEYMOUR S. ABENSOHN, C. P. A.
ADVISOR TO THE FIRM

Board of Directors
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

We have examined the statement of assets and liabilities arising from cash transactions of Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1984, and the related statement of revenue collected and expenses paid for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and, accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

As described in Note 1, the Association of Research Libraries' policy is to prepare its financial statements on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements; consequently, certain revenue and the related assets are recognized when received rather than when earned, and certain expenses are recognized when paid rather than when the obligation is incurred. Accordingly, the accompanying financial statements are not intended to present financial position and results of operations in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly the assets and liabilities arising from the cash transactions of Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1984, and the revenue collected and expenses paid during the year then ended, on the basis of accounting described in Note 1, which has been applied in a manner consistent with that of the preceding year.

Canto, Metro, Meyer & Co.
CANTO, METRO, MEYER & COMPANY
A Professional Corporation

March 5, 1985

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES
ARISING FROM CASH TRANSACTION
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

ASSETS

	GENERAL OPERATING FUND	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES	CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1983
Cash, including certificates of deposit of $ 416,326 in 1983 (Note 2)	$ 22,828	$ --	$ --	$ 22,828	$ 699,727
Investments, short-term at cost (Market value $ 521,322) (Note 3)	238,035	57,032	217,267	512,334	--
Accounts receivable	10,455	7,061		17,516	--
Prepaid expenses	5,586			5,586	--
Deposits	1,988			1,988	2,478
Furniture & equipment	60,278	37,005	30,062	127,345	111,820
Less: accumulated depreciation	(28,649)	(16,901)	(18,993)	(64,543)	(52,683)
Total	$ 310,521	$ 84,197	$ 228,336	$ 623,054	$ 761,342

LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

	GENERAL OPERATING FUND	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES	CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1983
Unapplied grant income (Schedule)	$ 62,374	$ 38,549	$	$ 100,923	$ 252,996
Obligation under capital lease (Note 4)	3,945	4,509	2,818	11,272	13,407
Grant payable (Note 5)	15,625	--	--	15,625	--
Dues collected in advance	5,010	--	--	5,010	--
Payroll taxes withheld	3,042	--	--	3,042	--
Total liabilities	89,996	43,058	2,818	135,872	266,403
Fund balances	220,525	41,139	225,518	487,182	494,939
Total	$ 310,521	$ 84,197	$ 228,336	$ 623,054	$ 761,342

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
GENERAL OPERATING FUND
STATEMENTS OF REVENUE COLLECTED AND EXPENSES PAID AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
REVENUE	1984	1983
Dues	$ 588,175	$ 450,450
Interest	33,913	26,928
Publications	14,817	10,742
Miscellaneous	4,133	--
	641,038	488,120
EXPENSES	565,079	514,166
Less: administrative expenses charged to special programs	(27,785)	(23,497)
Net expenses	537,294	490,669
Excess (deficiency) of revenue collected over expenses paid	103,744	(2,549)
Fund balance, beginning of year	125,261	127,810
Adjustments to fund balance		
Deficiency in special programs	(11,330)	--
Capitalization of equipment	2,850	--
Fund balance, end of year	$ 220,525	$ 125,261
	==========	==========

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
STATEMENT OF REVENUES COLLECTED AND EXPENSES PAID AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
	1984	1983
REVENUE		
Grants	$ 25,557	$ 45,000
Sales of publications	87,638	79,930
ARL support - transferred from general operating fund	110,000	95,000
Management Institutes/Training	51,724	70,456
Consultation	17,150	6,400
Interest income	11,009	4,977
Miscellaneous	1,221	900
Total revenue	304,299	302,663
EXPENSES	307,997	376,118
Deficiency of revenues collected over expenses paid	(3,698)	(73,455)
Deficiency of revenues collected over expense paid - special programs	(6,002)	--
Fund balance, beginning of year	50,839	124,294
Fund balance, end of year	$ 41,139	$ 50,839

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND
STATEMENTS OF REVENUES COLLECTED AND EXPENSES PAID AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
	1984	1983
REVENUE		
Grants	$ 50,000	$ 50,000.
Interest income	23,633	29,333
Sales of publications	49,358	94,927
	122,991	174,260
EXPENSES	216,312	222,169
Excess (deficiency) of revenues collected over expenses paid	(93,321)	(47,909)
Fund balance, beginning of year	318,839	366,748
Fund balance, end of year	$ 225,518	$ 318,839

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN CASH
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1983
SOURCES OF CASH		
Excess (deficiency) of revenue collected over expenses paid		
General Operating Fund	$ 103,744	$ (2,549)
Office of Management Studies	(3,698)	(55,785)
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	(93,321)	(47,909)
Special Programs - ARL	(11,330)	116,858
- OMS	(6,002)	
Total	$ (10,607)	10,615
Add item not requiring the outlay of cash - Depreciation	11,860	13,005
Cash provided by operations	1,253	23,620
Dues collected in advance	5,010	
Grant payable	15,625	
Decrease in deposits	490	(1,315)
Increase in payroll taxes withheld	3,042	(2,170)
Sale of equipment	--	6,805
Addition to obligations under capital lease	--	15,267
Total	25,420	42,207
USES OF CASH		
Prepaid expenses	5,586	--
Funding of accounts receivable	17,516	--
Reduction in lease obligation	2,135	1,860
Reduction in unapplied grant income	152,073	--
Purchase of equipment	12,675	26,269
Total	189,985	28,129
Increase (decrease) in cash	(164,565)	14,078
Cash, beginning of year	699,727	685,649
Cash, end of year	$ 535,162	$ 699,727

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

NOTE 1 - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

Organization

The Association of Research Libraries is a non-profit education organization comprised of 117 of the major research libraries in the United States and Canada. The purpose of the Association is to initiate and develop plans for strengthening research library resources and services in support of higher education and research. As part of its activities, the Association also operates the Center of Chinese Research Materials and the Office of Management Studies.

The Center for Chinese Research Materials was establshed by the Association in 1968. The Center serves primarily as a reprint publishing house which reproduces periodicals, documents, and research tool focusing on twentieth-century China.

The Office of Management Studies was established by the Association in 1970. The Office conducts research into organizational problems of research libraries, develops new management techniques, and offers information services and training.

Basis of accounting

The Association's policy is to prepare its financial statements on a modified cash basis. This includes recording depreciation and amortization on capitalized assets, accruing liabilities related to special programs and payroll withholding taxes. Under this basis, revenues are recognized when collected rather than when earned and expenditures are generally recognized when paid rather than when incurred.

Furniture, equipment and depreciation

Furniture and equipment are recorded at cost. Depreciation of furniture and equipment is provided on the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the assets.

Income taxes

The Association is exempted from income taxes under Internal Revenue Code Section 501 (C)(3) and applicable District of Columbia law.

Retirement plan

The Association has a retirement plan that covers substantially all full-time employees. Contributions to the plan are based on a percentage of salary for enrolled staff members. Total amounts paid in by the Association were $ 72,939 and $ 69,010 for 1984 and 1983 respectively.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(CONTINUED)

Note 2 - Cash

The Board of Directors has authorized restriction of $ 15,000 of the Association's funds and designated this amount as a program reserve fund. From this fund, a contribution of $ 1,000 was made to the Association of American Publishers - Electronic Publishing Project.

Note 3 - Investments

The Association's investments are managed by Dean Witter Reynolds, Washington, D.C. The investments are held as follows:

Dean Witter/Sears Liquid Asset Fund, Inc.	$ 25	- Interest rate 9.4%
Dean Witter U.S. Government Securities Trust	129,229	- Interest rate 12.71%
Unit Sears Government Investors Trust	392,068	- Interest rate 11.5%
Market Value	$ 521,322	

All accounts may be liquidated on any business day with proceeds payable within five business days.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(CONTINTUED)

Note 4 - Leases

The Association leases its office space under an operating lease that expires on December 31, 1985, and leases telephone equipment under a capital lease that expires on February 15, 1988.

Furniture and equipment includes leased property under a capital lease at December 31, 1984 as follows:

Cost	$ 16,455
Less: Accumulated Amortization	3,017
	$ 13,438

The future minimum lease payments as of December 31, 1984 are as follows:

	Capital Lease	Operating Lease
1985	$ 3,995	$ 70,387
1986	4,358	
1987	4,358	
1988	614	
Total minimum lease payments	$ 13,325	$ 70,387
Less: amount representing interest	2,053	
Present value of net minimum lease payments	$ 11,272	

Total rent and storage charges for the operating lease were $ 64,184 for 1984 and $ 61,408 for 1983.

NOTE 5 - Grant payable

A grant in the amount of $ 20,833 has been made to the University of Virginia for the statistical analysis project. To date, one quarterly payment of $ 5,208 has been made. The Council of Library Resources will provide one-half of the cost of this program. To date, one quarterly payment of $ 2,604 has been received.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Our examinations of the financial statements included in the preceding section of this report were directed to an expression of our opinion on those financial statements taken as a whole. The supplementary information included on pages 13 through 21 is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the examination of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

Canto, Metro, Meyer & Co.
CANTO, METRO, MEYER & COMPANY
A Professional Corporation

March 5, 1985

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
GENERAL OPERATING FUND
SCHEDULES OF EXPENSES
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
	1984	1983
STAFF EXPENSES		
Employee benefits	$ 54,243	$ 51,536
Salaries	207,311	199,092
Travel and entertainment	21,916	9,338
Total staff expenses	283,470	259,966
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES		
Communications	15,248	7,379
Depreciation	7,370	6,881
Dues	6,027	7,521
Insurance	300	1,278
Periodicals and subscriptions	3,305	1,717
Professional fees	22,354	20,182
Rent	22,538	20,943
Stationery and office	31,791	27,271
Total administrative expenses	108,933	93,172
PROGRAM AND SERVICES EXPENSES		
Funding for special programs -		
Microform	--	1,087
Office of Management Studies	110,000	95,000
Honorarium	--	1,350
Miscellaneous	--	886
Publications	17,718	19,237
Total program and services expenses	127,718	117,560
ARL MEETINGS AND TRAVEL EXPENSES		
ARL sponsored membership travel	1,303	1,125
Board meeting	3,359	9,960
Committees and task forces	16,444	10,055
Conferences	22,075	12,901
Executive committee meetings	2,018	5,361
Staff expenses	7,236	4,066
Total ARL meetings and travel expenses	52,435	43,468
Total	$ 572,556	$ 514,166

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
GENERAL OPERATING FUND
SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES BY FUNCTION
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

Management and general (includes transfers of $110,000 to OMS)	$ 446,961
Board and Executive Committee	7,120
Information/publication	15,225
Member meetings	35,629
ARL support to OMS	176
Scholarly communication	1,025
Access	4,095
NCIP - Access	676
Preservation Committee	12,083
Information policy	5,270
Staff development	8,415
Management improvement	5,090
Salary survey	3,283
Bibliographic Control Committee	7,409
Statistical Committee	12,403
Performance measurement	7,696
Total expenses	$ 572,556

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
	1984	1983
Consulting, computer and subcontractors	$ 7,247	$ 9,800
Depreciation	3,272	3,056
Employee benefits	31,046	34,082
Miscellaneous	5,102	2,092
Office expense	10,552	8,258
Periodicals and subscriptions	2,662	1,514
Postage	11,846	10,105
Printing	44,523	39,050
Rent and storage	22,968	20,031
Salaries	109,145	151,632
Telephone	4,188	9,330
Training (net)	12,202	21,225
Travel	43,244	65,943
Total	$ 307,997	$ 376,118

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
SCHEDULE OF EXPENSES BY FUNCTION
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

Research and development	$ 9,295
Academic Library Program	33,004
SPEC	67,064
Training - MSI	86,343
Grants Management	112,291
Total	$ 307,997

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND
SCHEDULES OF EXPENSES
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
	1984	1983
Allocated administrative charges	$ 27,785	$ 23,497
Consulting, computer and subcontractors	4,028	2,635
Depreciation	3,061	3,068
Employee benefits	18,657	18,686
Miscellaneous	126	452
Office expense	4,908	5,381
Payroll taxes	7,599	7,529
Periodicals and subscriliptions	72	88
Postage	190	1,919
Printing and duplication	38,413	46,647
Professional services	859	1,246
Rent and storage	18,261	20,540
Salaries	89,318	85,025
Telephone	895	855
Travel	2,140	4,601
Total	$ 216,312	$ 222,169

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
SPECIAL PROGRAMS
SCHEDULE OF OPERATIONS
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR 1983)
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	MICROFORM PRESERVATION	CONSER A&I	MICROFORM BIBLIOGRAPHIC	ANC-239	MICRO FILMING GUIDE	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS PROJECT	RECON. PLANNING STUDY	PROGRAM RESERVE FUND	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1983
REVENUES										
Grants	$ 36,489	$ 128,602	$ 12,747	$ 15,587	$ 10,510	$ 2,604	$ —	$ 1,000	$ 207,539	$ 81,325
ARL support										1,087
Interest income										2,188
Miscellaneous										810
Total revenues	36,489	128,602	12,747	15,587	10,510	2,604	—	1,000	207,539	85,410
EXPENSES										
Consulting, computer and subcontractors	29,607	67,464	10,022	—	8,747	5,208	--	—	121,048	37,241
Depreciation	1,035	1,850	--	--	--	--	--	—	2,885	—
Employee benefits	899	6,213	16	2,480	184	--	184	--	9,976	772
Miscellaneous	103	1,345	199	--	--	--	--	1,000	2,647	2,060
Office expense	1,524	1	151	—	160	--	--	—	1,836	4,814
Payroll taxes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	—	—	698
Postage	798	509	154	10	20	—	--	--	1,490	450
Printing & duplication	198	57	57	—	--	--	--	—	312	322
Rent & storage	3,277	--	876	—	--	--	--	--	4,153	13,163
Salaries	1,710	54,019	868	13,097	1,339	—	539	—	71,572	—
Telephone	137	--	174	—	60	--	—	—	372	708
Travel	454	1,306	230	—	—	588	—	--	2,578	2,916
Total expenses	$ 39,742	$ 132,764	$ 12,747	$ 15,587	$ 10,510	$ 5,796	$ 723	$ 1,000	$ 218,869	$ 63,144
Excess (deficiency) of revenues collected over expenses paid	$ (3,253)	$ (4,162)	$ --	$ —	$ —	$ (3,192)	$ (723)	$ —	$ (11,330)	$ 22,266

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
SPECIAL PROGRAMS
SCHEDULE OF OPERATIONS
(WITH COMPARATIVE TOTALS FOR 1983)
(MODIFIED CASH BASIS)

	PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECT (G.E. GRANT)	NATIONAL COLLECTION INVENTORY I & II	INSTITUTE OF LIBRARY SCHOOL EDUCATORS	PRESERVATION PLANNING (NEH GRANT)	ECONOMIC SEMINAR (CLR GRANT)	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31,	
REVENUES						1984	1983
Grants	$ 70,696	$ 92,993	$ 54,700	$ 8,400	$ 696	$ 227,485	$ 276,118
Interest	--	--	--	--	--	--	6,849
Total Revenue	70,696	92,993	54,700	8,400	696	227,485	282,967
EXPENSES							
Consulting, computer and subcontractors	5,991	--	3,194	--	135	9,320	3,588
Employee benefits	6,300	10,791	4,685	1,424	90	23,290	13,527
Miscellaneous	--	--	--	--	--	--	3,359
Office expense	1,834	1,097	247	146	143	3,467	30,992
Payroll taxes	--	--	--	--	--	--	210
Periodicals & subscriptions	160	90	123	--	--	373	--
Postage	420	668	250	--	--	1,338	193
Printing & duplication	2,381	1,949	1,107	363	--	5,800	1,336
Rent & storage	--	1,300	--	--	--	1,300	2,700
Salaries	33,480	41,376	22,465	7,312	328	104,961	78,804
Stipend	2,400	15,000	--	2,000	--	19,400	12,000
Telephone	1,295	1,423	641	480	--	3,839	304
Training (net)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Travel	16,435	19,299	23,482	1,182	--	60,398	23,692
Total expenses	70,696	92,993	56,195	12,907	696	233,487	170,705
Excess (deficiency) of revenue collected over expenses paid	$ -0-	$ -0-	$ (1,495)	$ (4,507)	$ -0-	$ (6,002)	$ 112,262

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN UNAPPLIED GRANT INCOME
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984

	MICROFORM (CLR MELLON)	MICROFORM PRESERVA-TION (NEH GRANT)	CONSER A&I	Z39	PRESERVA-TION MICRO-FILMING GUIDE	PROGRAM RESERVE FUND	MICROFORM BIBLIO-GRAPHIC (MELLON GRANT)	STATISTICAL ANALYSIS PROJECT	YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984	1983
Unapplied balance, beginning of year	$ (294)	$ 3,689	$ 23,825	$ (1,159)	$ --	$ --	$ 19,814	$ --	$ 45,875	$ --
Adjustments:										
Board creation of Program Reserve Fund	--	--	--	--	--	15,000	--	--	15,000	--
ARL Support	--	--		--	--	--	--	(15,625)	(15,625)	--
Current year's receipts:	--	32,800	139,700	16,746	25,000	--	--	10,417	224,663	--
Applied:										
To revenues - grants	--	(36,489)	(128,602)	(15,587)	(10,510)	(1,000)	(12,747)	(2,604)	(207,539)	--
Unapplied balance, end of year	$ (294)	$ --	$ 34,923	$ --	$ 14,490	$ 14,000	$ 7,067	$ (7,812)	$ 62,374	$ 45,875

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN UNAPPLIED GRANT INCOME
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1984

	ACADEMIC LIBRARY PROGRAM	PUBLIC SERVICE PROJECT (G.E. GRANT)	NATIONAL COLLECTION INVENTORY I & II	INSTITUTE OF LIBRARY SCHOOL EDUCATORS	MEYER GRANT	INDEX (WILSON FOUNDATION)	PRESERVATION PLANNING (NEH GRANT)	ECONOMIC SEMINAR (CLR GRANT)	COLLECTION ASSESSMENT	TOTAL
Unapplied balance, beginning of year	$ (8,700)	$ 100,329	$ 114,899	$ --	$ (939)	$ 2,175	$ --	$ --	$ (643)	$ 207,121
Adjustments:										
CLR reimbursements	8,700	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8,700
to charge excess 1983 expenses	--	--	(16,387)	--	--	--	--	--	--	(16,387)
Current year's receipts:	--	--	--	54,700	--	--	8,400	3,500	--	66,600
Applied:										
To revenues - grant	--	(70,696)	(92,993)	(54,700)	--	--	(8,400)	$ (696)	--	(227,485)
Unapplied balance, end of year	$ --	$ 29,633	$ 5,519	$ --	$ (939)	$ 2,175	$ --	$ 2,804	$ (643)	$ 38,549

The accompanying letter and notes are an integral part of these financial statements.